Please Note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy $\mbox{ \ I\ }\mbox{ \ N\ }\mbox{ \ D\ }\mbox{ \ E\ }\mbox{ \ X}$	
AGENDA ITEMS: JUNE 22, 1999:	<u>PAGE</u>
I. CALL TO ORDER	6
II. ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM	6
III. OPENING REMARKS	6
IV. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS	
Oral Reports from Board Members	9
Oral Report from the Executive Director and Executive Staff	12
Oral Report on the Status of the 21st Century Policy Development Process	None
V. CONTINUED BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS	
Agenda Item B: [Moved forward to July meeting]	
Agenda Item A: Consideration of Redirection of 1998/1999 Fiscal Year IWMA Savings for Alternative Projects	14
VI. CONSENT AGENDA	
Consideration of Approval of Consent Agenda Items 13, 14(A) and 15(A)	32
VII. NEW BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS	
Permits, LEA and Facility Compliance:	
Agenda Item 2: Consideration of Progress Made by Inyo County Integrated Waste Management and the Department of Environmental Health Services as Local Enforcement Agency for Inyo County since	35
March 23, 1999	33
Agenda Item 3: Consideration of Revision to the Regulations for the Storage of Waste Tires	46
Agenda Item 4: Consideration of Approval to Formally Notice Proposed Regulations to Update	

Enforcement Related Provisions in Title 14	96
Agenda Item 9: Consideration of a Revised Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Forward Landfill, San Joaquin County	01
Agenda Item 10: Consideration of a Revised Solid Waste Facility Permit for the Tehachapi Sanitary Landfill, Kern County)9
Legislation:	
Agenda Item 12: Consideration and Approval of the Final Report on the California Waste Tire Program in Response to the Requirements of AB 117 (Escutia)	19
Waste Prevention and Market Development:	
Agenda Item 14(B): Consideration and Approval of Award of Interagency Agreement with the University of California at Riverside for the Development of Generic Guidance, Educational, and Training Materials for the Landscape Management Outreach Program	57
Agenda Item 15(B): Consideration and Approval of award of Award of Contract for the 2000 Grasscycling Public Education Campaign to the Bureau of Sanitation for the City of Los Angeles 15	58
Agenda Item 16: Consideration of Approval of the Revised Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Project Eligibility Criteria 16	60
Agenda Item 18: Consideration of Approval of Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application for Grover Landscape Services, Inc	90
Administration and Policy:	
Agenda Item 19: Consideration and Approval of Reallocation of Previously Approved Contract Concept Monies to Augment Contract #IWM-C7039 with the California Conservation Corps	96

	5
Agenda Item 20: Consideration of Award of Contract Augmentation of \$500,000 to California	
Conservation Corps for Contract #IWM-C7039	203
IX. ADJOURNMENT	212

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1999

9:30 O'CLOCK A.M.

---00---

I. CALL TO ORDER

10

11

13

14

18

19

2.2

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: GOOD MORNING

EVERYONE, AND WELCOME TO THE JUNE 22, AND TOMORROW'S JUNE 23RD, MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD.

II. ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM

CHAIRMAN EATON: MADAM SECRETARY, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

12 MEMBER JONES: HERE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: HERE.

THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI?

16 MEMBER ROBERTI: HERE.

17 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: HERE.

III. OPENING REMARKS

20 CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT, DO ANY MEMBERS HAVE

21 ANY EX PARTES THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO REPORT?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: OR NEED TO, I SHOULD SAY.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: A JUNE 15, '99, LETTER OR
REQUEST FROM MICHAEL LANG (PHON) WITH THE DOCUMENTARY FILM,
TO FUND A DOCUMENTARY ON WASTE TIRES, WHICH IS ITEM NO. A.

ON ITEM 12, A JUNE 17TH LETTER FROM MELP (PHON) REGARDING ITS CONCERNS ABOUT RECOMMENDATION NUMBER EIGHT, THE WASTE TIRE PROGRAM REPORT.

ITEM NO. 37, JUNE 8, 9 AND 14 ARE DATED

LETTERS FROM JERRY JAMGOTCHIAN (PHON) REGARDING THE CITY OF

HAWTHORNE.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

JUNE 14, A LETTER DATED -- LETTER FROM THE CITY OF NORWALK VOICING THE L.A. COUNTY'S JURISDICTIONS' CONCERN WITH THE SYSTEMATIC DEFICIENCY OF THE BOARD'S DISPOSAL QUALITY REPORTING SYSTEM.

AND A JUNE 16 LETTER DATED -- OR, JOINT LETTER FROM THE LEAGUE AND CSAC (PHON) REGARDING THEIR CONCERNS OF THREE RECENT BOARD ACTIONS.

I THINK THAT COVERS EVERYTHING.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. MR. JONES?

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, ALL MY WRITTEN

CORRESPONDENCE WERE UP TO DATE. THEY WERE THE SAME ONES I

THINK THAT MR. PENNINGTON GOT.

BUT I HAD A MEETING YESTERDAY WITH PAUL GLADFELTY (PHON) AND DAVID ACKERMAN (PHON) TALKING ABOUT

INERTS.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

TALKED TO JOE MONTOYA ON SOME SPENDING AND RAIL HAUL ISSUES, OR ALLOCATION ISSUES.

THIS MORNING HAD MY QUICK HELLO TO MR. CUPPS (PHON), AND BOB WINTERS, MIKE CAPRIEL (PHON) FROM ALLIED.

AND THEN IN THE AUDIENCE IS -- I WROTE A

LETTER TO HIM, PAUL VALLONE, WHO IS GOING TO BE LEAVING

CALIFORNIA. PAUL'S WITH THE STOCKTON COGEN FOLKS AND HE'S

GOING TO BE MOVING TO TEXAS TO TAKE OVER A BIG OPERATION

THERE. SO, I WANT TO WISH HIM GOOD LUCK. AND HE DID A LOT

ON OUR USING TIRE CHIPS AS A SUPPLEMENTAL FUEL IN STOCKTON,

WORKED HARD WITH THIS BOARD. SO, WISH HIM NOTHING BUT LUCK.

CHAIRMAN EATON: SENATOR ROBERTI?

MEMBER ROBERTI: YES. I HAVE A LETTER FROM BOB JUDD (PHON) REGARDING THE WASTE TIRE REPORT.

AND, I MET YESTERDAY WITH JAN ANERIN (PHON)
REGARDING WASTE TIRE STORAGE REGULATIONS.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. AND I HAVE TWO, AS WELL.

ELLEN SETTLEMEYER (PHON), OF CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO,

REGARDING THE SRRE COMPLIANCE LETTER, AND DAVID LANE (PHON)

FROM THE CITY OF CLEARLAKE REGARDING THE SRRE COMPLIANCE

LETTER, AS WELL.

SO, I BELIEVE I GOT THE BOB JUDD LETTER AND ED DEMAYO (PHON) LETTER AS WELL, ON THE ITEM ON TODAY'S

CALENDAR.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO MAY BE NEW HERE, THERE ARE SOME SPEAKER SLIPS IN THE BACK WHERE THE GENTLEMEN ARE LEANING OVER THE TABLE. IF YOU'D KINDLY FILL THOSE OUT AND PUT THE NUMBER OF THE AGENDA ITEM OR ITEMS, AS THE CASE MAY BE, AND BRING THEM FORWARD TO LISA DOMINGUEZ ON MY LEFT, AND FOR MOST OF YOU ON YOUR RIGHT, AND SHE'LL MAKE SURE THAT THEY ARE GIVEN TO ME, AND SO THAT I CAN RECOGNIZE YOU AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME SO THAT YOU CAN MAKE YOUR COMMENT AND MAKE SURE THAT YOUR OPINIONS ARE PUT ON THE RECORD.

IV. REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

ORAL REPORTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

CHAIRMAN EATON: DO ANY BOARD MEMBERS HAVE ANY REPORTS THAT THEY'D LIKE TO BRING UP, OR MATTERS? MR. PENNINGTON?

17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: NO, I'M FINE,

MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES?

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST A QUICK REPORT

ON A -- LAST MONDAY, THE 14TH, I WAS A SPEAKER AT A MEETING

THAT WAS PUT TOGETHER WITH CALIFORNIA TRADE AND COMMERCE

WITH A ASIAN DELEGATION, CAME OVER TO A NATIONAL SOLID WASTE

MANAGEMENT CONVENTION IN DALLAS AND WAS LOOKING FOR

TECHNOLOGY AND IDEAS ON HOW TO DEAL WITH THEIR WASTE STREAMS IN THE PACIFIC RIM.

AND I WANT TO THANK HEIDI AND MARSHALLEE

(PHON) FROM OUR LOCAL ASSISTANCE WHO CAME DOWN AND PROVIDED

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND EXPERTISE AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE

FOR THOSE FOLKS. THEY WERE ABLE TO USE -- TALK TO THEM

ABOUT OUR PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA.

ONE OF OUR MISSIONS IS TO BE NOT ONLY A STATE LEADER AND A NATIONAL LEADER, BUT TO BE AN INTERNATIONAL LEADER, AND THOSE PEOPLE ALL CAME TO CALIFORNIA WITH THE IDEA THAT WE LEAD OUR NATION IN SOLID WASTE ACTIVITIES AND WHAT WE DO. AND I THINK IT WAS A PRETTY GOOD DAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT. SENATOR ROBERTI?

MEMBER ROBERTI: YESTERDAY I WAS IN GRIDLEY AND

ACTUALLY I WAS VERY IMPRESSED BY THE LEVEE PROJECT USING

WASTE TIRES. IF THE PROJECT WORKS OUT THAT'S 45,000 WASTE

TIRES A QUARTER MILE. AT SOME POINT IN THE FUTURE THAT

COULD SOLVE THE WASTE TIRE PROBLEM. THAT'S AN ENORMOUS

NUMBER.

AND CHICO STATE ENGINEERS, WHO ARE
INSTRUMENTAL IN PUTTING THIS TOGETHER, ARE VERY ENTHUSIASTIC
ABOUT IT. SO, THE WHOLE BUSINESS IS JUST TO CONVINCE THE
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, AND I THINK IT'S POSSIBLE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: GREAT. YOU DID A GOOD JOB, AND I

THINK SET OUT THE POLICY OF THE BOARD AS WELL IN THE ARTICLE, AND I THINK IT'S A GOOD ARTICLE THAT WE SHOULD, YOU KNOW, TREASURE, AS WELL AS PROMOTE IT. LET'S KEEP OUR FINGERS CROSSED THAT IT ACTUALLY DOES WORK. WE DON'T GET TOO MANY OF THOSE HOME RUNS, OR TRIPLES OR DOUBLES, AS THE CASE MAY BE.

I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO REPORT.

ORAL REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND EXECUTIVE STAFF

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND AS USUAL, AT THIS TIME I GO
DIRECTLY INTO THE CONTINUING BUSINESS ITEMS, BUT I LEARNED
MY LESSON AND I WILL DEFER TO MR. CHANDLER, BUT I
CONTINUALLY FORGOT TO ALLOW HIM THE TIME TO DO HIS EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR'S REPORT.

SO, MR. CHANDLER, ANYTHING TO REPORT?

MR. CHANDLER: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MAYBE JUST FOR REVIEW WITH MEMBERS ROBERTI
AND MEMBER PENNINGTON. YESTERDAY I ACCOMPANIED CHAIRMAN
EATON AND MEMBER JONES TO A MEETING WITH SECRETARY HICKHOCK
(PHON) JUST TO REVIEW OUR EFFORTS IN RUBBERIZED ASPHALT
CONCRETE. HE ASKED FOR THIS BRIEFING SPECIFICALLY ON THAT
TOPIC.

WE DELVED EXTENSIVELY INTO THE SUBJECT AREA FOR UP TO AN HOUR, AND REVIEWED THE PAST HISTORY THIS BOARD

HAS HAD IN PROMOTING RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE, AS WELL AS WHERE WE SEE SOME OF THE LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS GOING IN THE FUTURE.

WE ALSO TOOK AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS TODAY'S REPORT BRIEFLY WITH THE SECRETARY, AS WELL.

2.2

I'D ALSO LIKE TO ADD THAT WE'RE MAKING

CONSIDERABLE PROGRESS WITH SECRETARY EILEEN ADAMS (PHON) IN

HER AGENCY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENSURING SUSTAINABLE AND

GREEN BUILDING DESIGN COMPONENTS AND CONCEPTS GO INTO THE

EAST END PROJECT. WE HAD OUR -- WHAT AMOUNTS TO I THINK OUR

FOURTH MEETING WITH THE DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL

SERVICES AND SOME OF HIS KEY STAFF PEOPLE, AS WELL AS

SECRETARY HICKHOCK AND SECRETARY ADAMS.

AND CHAIRMAN EATON AND MYSELF PROVIDED

COMMENTS TO THE JOINT RULES REPORT THAT CAME FROM KIND OF A

COLLECTION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS. AND I WOULD JUST SAY

THAT WE'RE MAKING SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS ON THAT FRONT WITH

THE EFFORT THAT WE'VE BEEN INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN. AND

WE NOW HAVE AN MOU IN PLACE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL

SERVICES, THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION, THE AIR

RESOURCES BOARD, THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES AND

OURSELVES TO ENSURE AN ONGOING WORKING RELATIONSHIP IN THAT

REGARD.

SO, THOSE ARE KIND OF THE TWO KEY AREAS THAT

HAVE BEEN OF LATE THAT I WANTED TO JUST UPDATE THE BOARD ON,
AND THAT PRETTY MUCH CONCLUDES MY COMMENTS FOR TODAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY, THANK YOU.

ANY QUESTIONS OF MR. CHANDLER?

ORAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE 21ST CENTURY POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. THERE'S NOTHING NEW TO REPORT ON THE 21ST CENTURY POLICY, OTHER THAN WHAT WAS REPORTED THE LAST TIME.

V. CONTINUED BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: MOVING RIGHT TO CONTINUED

BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS. BEFORE WE BEGIN THAT, ITEM B, WHICH

IS THE RPPC, THE CIRCUMSTANCES HAVE NOT CHANGED AND SO WE

WILL NOT BE HEARING THAT TODAY, AND IF WE CAN JUST CONTINUE

IT TO NEXT JULY -- TO OUR NEXT MEETING IN JULY?

ANY OBJECTION TO THAT?

MEMBER JONES: NO.

CHAIRMAN EATON: HEARING NONE, SO ORDERED.

AGENDA ITEM A: CONSIDERATION OF REDIRECTION OF

1998/1999 FISCAL YEAR IWMA SAVINGS FOR ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. A, CONSIDERATION OF REDIRECTION OF 1998/99 IWMA SAVINGS FOR ALTERNATIVE

PROJECTS. MS. FISH.

MS. FISH: THANK YOU, CHAIRMAN EATON, KAREN FISH

FROM THE DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

THIS ITEM, CONTINUED FROM LAST MONTH, IS THE REDIRECTION OF '98-99 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT FUNDS FOR ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS.

THE PROJECTS LISTED REMAIN THE SAME AS IN *?

CHANGE FROM LAST MONTH, HOWEVER, THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

WAS MODIFIED TO ACCOMMODATE THE LATENESS IN THE FISCAL YEAR,

AS WELL AS FUNDING LIMITATIONS.

PROJECTS ONE, FOUR, SIX, SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE AND 14 IN COLUMN "A" TOTAL 762,000, AND THE RECOMMENDATION IS THAT THAT BE ALLOTTED FROM THE '98-99 IWMA.

BASED ON BOARD DIRECTION STAFF WILL BRING
BACK PROJECTS TWO AND FIVE, ONE FOR 45,511 AND ONE FOR
200,000 IN THE SECOND COLUMN, TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING
UNDER THE RMDZ FUNDS. PROJECT 10, FOR 50,000, WAS
PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED BY THE BOARD UNDER RMDZ.

THE REMAINING PROJECTS ARE TO BE DEFERRED

AND, BASED ON BOARD DIRECTION, WILL BE CONSIDERED WITH THE

CONTRACT CONCEPTS FOR THE

'99-2000 FISCAL YEAR THAT ACTUALLY BEGINS NEXT FRIDAY. SO,

BASED ON BOARD DIRECTION, THOSE CONCEPTS COULD BE CONSIDERED

AT THAT TIME FOR THE AGENDA ITEM THAT IS SCHEDULED TO COME

BACK FOR THE CONTRACT CONCEPTS PROBABLY JULY OR AUGUST.

DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIFIC QUESTIONS?

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS OF

MS. FISH?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I ONLY HAD ONE -

_

10

11

12

13

16

17

19

22

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- QUESTION ON THE PROPOSED

ALLOCATION. UNDER THE GARDEN IN EVERY SCHOOL GRANT PROGRAM,

NOTICE THAT THE SCHOOLS THAT WE'RE GETTING, AND SOME OF THEM

WERE HIGH SCHOOLS. I THOUGHT THIS WAS JUST A PROGRAM FOR

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

MS. FISH: IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IT IS FOR BOTH. BUT PERHAPS A STAFF PERSON, OR MAYBE A BOARD MEMBER'S OFFICE WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THIS.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I MEAN, IT'S NOT A BIG DEAL, I

JUST --

MS. FISH: I THINK IT IS --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I JUST THOUGHT IT WAS AN

18 ELEMENTARY --

MS. FISH: I THINK IT IS FOR BOTH.

20 MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- SCHOOL PROGRAM. BUT, YOU

21 KNOW, HIGH SCHOOLERS CAN GROW GARDENS TOO, I DON'T CARE.

MS. FISH: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS THAT I CAN'T

23 ANSWER?

CHAIRMAN EATON: WE HAVE ONE SPEAKER, MISTER --

MEMBER ROBERTI: WELL --

CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M SORRY. SENATOR ROBERTI, I'M SORRY.

MEMBER ROBERTI: JUST TO GO OVER I GUESS *I THE BRIEFINGS. BUT THE AMOUNT HAS NOW BEEN PARED DOWN FROM WHAT IT WAS BEFORE US PREVIOUSLY.

MS. FISH: RIGHT.

MEMBER ROBERTI: BUT THOSE OTHER MATTERS CAN COME, OR WILL COME BEFORE US AGAIN, WHAT...?

MS. FISH: RIGHT. BASED ON YOUR DIRECTION TODAY,

STAFF ARE LOOKING FOR DIRECTION ON THE TWO THAT ARE

12 RECOMMENDED UNDER RMDZ --

MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH.

MS. FISH: -- FOR THE BOARD TO GIVE US DIRECTION TO BRING THOSE BACK FOR CONSIDERATION.

AND THEN I BELIEVE, BASED ON DIRECTIONS, THAT MOST OF THE CONCEPTS UNDER THE DEFER

18 COLUMN --

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER ROBERTI: RIGHT.

MS. FISH: -- HAVE BEEN FORWARDED TO THE CONTRACT STAFF TO BE INCLUDED AS CONTRACT CONCEPTS. BUT THAT'S ALSO BASED ON BOARD DIRECTION, FOR THOSE THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO BE CONSIDERED.

24 MEMBER ROBERTI: OKAY. SO THE THREE RMDZS WILL BE

BROUGHT BACK -- IS THERE A TIME SCHEDULE ON THOSE?

MS. FISH: NO, THAT ONE DOESN'T -- THEY'RE NOT AS

CRITICAL OTHER THAN, YOU KNOW, BEING DRIVEN BY THE PROJECT

TIME LINE. WE HAVE THE RMDZ MONEY AVAILABLE FOR

ENCUMBRANCE, SO IT'S AS SOON AS STAFF GET THEM READY AND GET

THEM NOTICED THEY COULD BRING THEM BACK.

MEMBER ROBERTI: OKAY. AND THE DEFERS ARE BEING PREPARED FOR A CONTRACT.

MS. FISH: FOR CONTRACT CONCEPTS, FOR CONSIDERATION --

MEMBER ROBERTI: CONTRACT CONCEPT, RATHER, YEAH.

MS. FISH: -- WHEN THE BOARD SEES ALL OF THE CONTRACT CONCEPTS FOR THE FUNDING THAT WE -- THAT BECOMES AVAILABLE JULY 1ST, WE'LL BRING THOSE BACK IN ITEMS AND THERE'LL BE NUMEROUS CONCEPTS, INCLUDING THESE --

MEMBER ROBERTI: OKAY.

MS. FISH: -- THAT THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER.

18 MEMBER ROBERTI: OKAY. I UNDERSTAND. VERY GOOD,

19 THANK YOU.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

MS. FISH: OKAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: WE HAVE ONE SPEAKER, A MR. JOSEPH

22 MONTOYA.

MR. MONTOYA: CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, JOE MONTOYA

24 FROM MONTOYA MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, I LIVE IN WHITTIER,

CALIFORNIA, NEXT TO THE PUENTE HILLS LANDFILL AND THE ATHENS (PHON).

I HAD WANTED TO COMMENT -- I WAS LOOKING FOR

-- BACK THERE FOR THE ITEMS ON WHAT WAS ITEM 5 ON YOUR

AGENDA OF JUNE 9TH RELATING TO THESE ISSUES THAT WE'RE

TALKING ABOUT IN, WHAT? -- V.-A., AND I HAD WANTED TO WRITE

A LETTER IN VIEW OF THE DISCUSSION THAT TOOK PLACE AT THE

LAST MEETING AND THEN I THOUGHT, WELL, THERE MIGHT BE SOME

HETEROPHOBIC BEE REPORTER HERE WANTING TO GRILL EACH OF THE

MEMBERS AS TO WHAT COMMENTS I MADE OR WHAT COMMENTS I WROTE

ABOUT, SO I THOUGHT, WELL, I'LL JUST COME AND MAKE THE

COMMENTS PUBLICLY.

2.2

THE CONCERN THAT I WANTED TO BRING TO THE BOARD WAS JUST LOOKING AT THESE, I THINK IT WAS, 14 ITEMS, THAT THERE SEEMED TO BE A LOT OF INTERAGENCY AGREEMENTS.

AND MY THOUGHT PROCESS WAS THAT I THINK CITIES, COUNTIES AND ALL OF THESE JURISDICTIONS ALREADY COLLECT FROM THE PRIVATE HAULERS A LOT OF MONEY TO DO RECYCLING EDUCATION AND ALL OF THOSE KINDS OF THINGS.

AND THEN THE -- FURTHER BACK ON IT, HAVING

COME TO THE BOARD BEFORE AND FINDING THAT MANY OF THESE

JURISDICTIONS DON'T EVEN ATTEND MEETINGS, LET ALONE FOLLOW

THROUGH ON AB 939, I THOUGHT, WELL, IT SEEMS TO ME ADEQUATE

TO MAKE THE PUBLIC COMMENT THAT THOSE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS IN

MANY INSTANCES ARE ALREADY GETTING MONEY TO BE DOING THE KIND OF WORK THAT SHOULD BE DONE FOR WHICH YOU ARE HANDING OUT MONEY HERE.

THERE WERE TWO OR THREE SPECIFIC ONES THAT I
WAS CONCERNED ABOUT, AND I -- AGAIN, I DON'T HAVE -- WAS
THERE SOMETHING IN BLACK AND WHITE ON THE AGENDA BACK -- OR,
IN WRITING FOR WHAT'S GOING THROUGH TODAY?

MS. FISH: THERE IS A BRIEF DESCRIPTION IN THE ITEM OF EACH ONE OF THE PROJECTS.

2.2

MR. MONTOYA: OH, OKAY. BUT, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE WAS ONE THAT HAD CAUGHT MY -- OKAY. THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GRANT, GARDEN IN EVERY SCHOOL. AND I THINK IF I READ IT CORRECTLY 12 SCHOOLS IN 28 SCHOOL DISTRICTS. IT SEEMS LIKE THAT'S A LOT OF MONEY GIVEN THE EXPERIENCE OF KNOWING YOU CAN PUT TOGETHER A HALF-AN-HOUR PROGRAM AS A LOCAL HAULER WHO -- THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, LIKE I CONSULT WITH, FOR IT SEEMS A LOT CHEAPER THAN THAT. TWELVE SCHOOLS IN 28 SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR \$195,000 DOESN'T SEEM TO BE A LOT OF CLOUT, OR A LOT FOR THE MONEY.

THERE WAS ANOTHER ONE, THE INTERAGENCY

AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES TO INITIATE A

PROGRAM, EDUCATION CAMPAIGN TO IMPROVE THE COMMINGLED

COLLECTION SYSTEM. THERE THAT BROUGHT TO MIND SOMETHING

ELSE ALSO.

THERE WHO HAVE GONE THROUGH WHAT I THINK THE BOARD AND THE LEGISLATURE IDEALLY WANTED WITH AB 1939, AND THAT WAS, YOU KNOW, TEACH THE PEOPLE TO SEPARATE THE TRASH AT HOME AND, THEREFORE, YOU END UP WITH TWO OR THREE CONTAINERS. NOW IT SEEMS LIKE WE'RE GOING BACK TO THE DIRTY MRF'ING (PHON) WHERE THE PEOPLE DON'T HAVE TO SEPARATE ANYTHING AT HOME, JUST PUT IT ALL IN THERE, CHARGE THEM THREE DOLLARS MORE A MONTH, AND THEN IT CAN BE SEPARATED AT SOME MRF, AND IT SEEMS THAT SOME CONSIDERATION SHOULD HAVE GONE INTO THAT.

THERE WAS I THINK SOMETHING IN

HERE -- OH, YES. DID YOU INDICATE THAT THE DOCUMENTARY WAS

NO LONGER IN HERE?

MS. FISH: THAT IS IN THE DEFERRED, TO BE BROUGHT BACK AT A LATER DATE.

MR. MONTOYA: BECAUSE THERE AGAIN, GENTLEMEN, I HAPPEN TO BE A PERSON WHO BUYS A LOT OF THESE EDUCATIONAL VIDEOS, AND WHETHER I BUY THEM FROM KVIE (PHON) OR I BUY THEM FROM PBS IN LOS ANGELES, OR YOU BUY THEM FROM THE DISCOVERY CHANNEL OR THE HISTORY CHANNEL, YOU NEVER GET BY WITHOUT PAYING LESS THAN \$30.00.

AND IT SEEMED TO ME THAT IF THE BOARD WAS GOING TO FINANCE SOMETHING IN PUBLIC TELEVISION, NO MATTER WHAT IT BE, THAT YOU HAVE SOME SAY AS TO WHAT THE INPUT IS

GOING TO BE, BECAUSE MANY OF THESE PROGRAMS DON'T COME OUT

EXACTLY AS THEY WERE SOLD OR AS YOU ANTICIPATE. THE

BUSINESS GUY ALWAYS SEEMS TO BE THE BAD GUY IN A LOT OF THIS

PUBLIC EDUCATION TELEVISION. SO THAT, NUMBER ONE, THE

NOTION OF CONTENT AND THE BOARD HAVING SOME SAY IN THAT.

THE SECOND THING IS IF IN FACT THIS IS GOING

TO BE MONEY -- A REVENUE-PRODUCING ITEM FOR PUBLIC

TELEVISION, IT WOULD SEEM THAT YOU AS THE FUNDERS OF THESE

VENTURES WOULD GET SOMETHING BACK SO THAT THEN, IN FACT, THE

BOARD COULD REDISTRIBUTE EVEN SOME MORE MONEY TO DO SOME

OTHER PROJECTS.

2.2

AND LAST BUT NOT LEAST, UNRELATED TO THESE

ITEMS HERE, AS I HAD TALKED TO YOU BOARD MEMBER JONES, THE

IDEA -- I DIDN'T KNOW IF THIS WAS THE APPROPRIATE PLACE FOR

MAYBE DOING SOMETHING ABOUT A STUDY FOR WASTE BY RAIL.

THERE -- I THINK IT SEEMS THAT IN THE '80S

THERE WAS A LOT OF TALK ABOUT WASTE BY RAIL. RECENTLY THERE

WAS A BIG CONFERENCE A THE ROSE (PHON) INSTITUTE IN WHICH

THERE WERE A LOT OF ENTREPRENEURS, A LOT OF CITIES, A LOT OF

VARIOUS JURISDICTIONS NATIONALLY TALKING ABOUT WASTE BY

RAIL.

THERE REALLY ARE ONLY APPARENTLY TWO PROJECTS HAPPENING IN THE UNITED STATES THAT I KNOW OF THAT I HAD A CHANCE TO CHECK ON. ONE IS THE ONE IN NAPA, THE OTHER VERY

BIG ONE I GUESS IS HAPPENING IN SEATTLE WHERE THEY'RE DOING 4,000 TONS A DAY. OTHER THAN THAT I THINK THE ONLY THING THERE WAS ON THE INTERNET WAS A PROJECT IN ONTARIO, CANADA. BUT THERE AGAIN, IT WOULD SEEM LIKE AS A MINIMUM PERHAPS THE BOARD COULD BE A REPOSITORY OF UPDATED INFORMATION ON WHERE WASTE BY RAIL IS GOING AND WHO THE KEY PLAYERS SEEM TO BE. AND CERTAINLY AS A PUBLIC ENTITY I THINK IT BELONGS HERE.

I THINK THE DIFFICULTLY WITH WASTE BY RAIL IN THE DISCUSSIONS HAVE BEEN THAT ALL OF THE TWO OR THREE LARGE PRIVATE COMPANIES THAT ARE LEFT, THE \$20 BILLION COMPANIES, WOULD LIKE TO DO THEIR OWN PRIVATE THING. I THINK WASTE BY RAIL IS SOMETHING THAT HAS TO BE TO SOME EXTENT PUBLICLY FUNDED, AND SOMETHING THAT IS -- WHERE THE BOARD AND THE LEGISLATURE AND THE GOVERNOR ARE INTIMATELY INVOLVED, BECAUSE I THINK IT'S A PUBLIC INTEREST KIND OF A PROJECT. SO PERHAPS THIS IS THE PLACE, OR SOMEWHERE ELSE, AND IN THE FUTURE YOU CAN LOOK AT THE IDEA OF FUNDING SOMETHING FOR THAT.

THANK YOU AGAIN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I THANK YOU,

2.2

2.3

MR. MONTOYA. JUST A COUPLE OF GENERAL COMMENTS. ONE IS
THAT THE ISSUE OF -- THAT YOU RAISED WITH REGARD TO THE TV
DOCUMENTARY AND CERTAIN THINGS NOT FLESHED OUT, THAT WAS

PROBABLY ONE OF THE REASONS THAT I BELIEVE THAT STAFF DID

NOT BRING THAT FORWARD, BECAUSE SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT YOU

RAISED AS WELL AS OTHER ISSUES WERE NOT FLESHED OUT YET. SO

THAT WAS KIND OF GOING....

THE RAIL HAULERS ARE A PERFECT EXAMPLE, I
THINK WE'LL LOOK INTO IT, I THINK NOT ONLY AS PART OF THE
21ST CENTURY --

MR. MONTOYA: RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- AS TO THE CONFIGURATION, AS WELL AS OTHER KINDS OF THINGS AS WELL.

MR. MONTOYA: THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: BUT THAT WILL OBVIOUSLY BE
SOMETHING THAT AS WE TURN THE CORNER AND GO INTO THE NEXT
SORT OF MILLENNIUM OR CENTURY AND THAT, ALL KINDS OF THESE
ISSUES WILL RE-ARISE, AND SOME WILL BE TAKEN, YOU KNOW, BACK
TO THE GRAVE, SOME WILL RISE FROM THE GRAVE, AND I THINK,
YOU KNOW, THAT NONE OF THEM SHOULD BE DISMISSED OUT OF HAND.

MR. MONTOYA: IT'LL HELP IF IT CAN RISE ON EASTER SUNDAY, TOO, PROBABLY. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU.

SENATOR ROBERTI.

MEMBER ROBERTI: AS I UNDERSTAND IT, WHAT THE CITY OF L.A. WANTED, SOMETHING THAT

24 MR. MONTOYA TOUCHED ON, WAS TO EDUCATE CITIZENS ON WHAT CAN

GO INTO A RECYCLABLE BIN AND WHAT CANNOT. IT WASN'T NECESSARILY ENCOURAGE OR DISCOURAGE DIRTY MURPHYING. AM I RIGHT OR AM I WRONG, OR...?

MEMBER JONES: YOU'RE RIGHT.

MEMBER ROBERTI: IS THAT RIGHT?

MEMBER JONES: YOU'RE RIGHT.

MEMBER ROBERTI: BECAUSE AS MR. MONTOYA SORT OF INDICATED, IT WAS GEARED TOWARD SORT OF PUSHING DIRTY MURPHYING, AND I WOULD AGREE WITH HIM THAT -- I MEAN, I DON'T LIKE THE IDEA OF OUR DOING THAT, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT WAS THE POINT, I THINK....

MEMBER JONES: YEAH. MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER JONES: I AGREE WITH THE SENATOR. I THINK
THAT THE ITEM NOW, DEALING WITH THE EDUCATIONAL SIDE OF IT I
CAN SUPPORT. I THINK THAT THE BENEFIT THAT L.A. CITY GOT
WITH INCREASING THEIR TONNAGES BY ABOUT 220% BECAUSE THEY
WENT TO A COMMINGLED RECYCLING IS IMPORTANT. I MEAN, THAT
IS A HUGE NUMBER.

AND I THINK THEY MADE IT EASY ENOUGH THAT
THEY'VE GOT 120% MORE PARTICIPATION. AND YOU'RE STILL DOING
A SORT, YOU'RE STILL MAKING A CHOICE BETWEEN THROWING IT IN
A GARBAGE CAN OR THROWING IT INTO A RECYCLING BIN, YOU'RE
JUST NOT THROWING IT IN THREE RECYCLING BINS.

THE PROBLEM IS PEOPLE ARE CONTAMINATING THAT MATERIAL, AND THIS STUDY, IF WE CAN -- AND I'M PRETTY COMFORTABLE WITH THE SCOPE OF WORK, THERE'S A COUPLE OF THINGS I'D LIKE TO SEE WHEN THEY DO THE SCOPE TO JUST HAVE SOME -- TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON IT.

BUT I THINK IDENTIFYING THE AREAS, THAT WHERE A ROUTE PICKS UP AND THERE'S A LOT OF CONTAMINATION CAN BE IDENTIFIED RIGHT AWAY AND THEN ADDRESS THAT NEIGHBORHOOD, LET THEM KNOW THE IMPACTS THEY'RE HAVING ON THE PROGRAM, THAT IS GOING TO ADD TO THE INTEGRITY OF THAT PROGRAM OUICKER THAN ANYTHING.

AND I THINK IT CAN BE USED -- I THINK THIS
KIND OF WORK CAN BE USED IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY, IN THE CITY
OF SACRAMENTO, BECAUSE THEY'RE HAVING THE SAME TYPES OF
PROBLEMS HERE WITH HIGH LEVELS OF CONTAMINATION AT A MURPH
FROM A COMMINGLED RECYCLING PROGRAM AS THEY'RE HAVING IN
L.A. SO I THINK THERE'S GOING TO BE SOME VALUE IN WHAT THE
OUTCOME OF THIS IS.

MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH, ONE -- I THINK IT'S -- JUST AS A LITTLE ASIDE, ONE OF THE THINGS I'VE LEARNED IN MY LITTLE TRIPS AROUND THE WORLD IS THAT SOMETIMES PEOPLE TRY TO BE TOO GOOD.

MEMBER JONES: EXACTLY.

2.2

MEMBER ROBERTI: AND, FOR EXAMPLE, ON NEWSPAPER

RECYCLING, ONE OF THE MAJOR PROBLEMS, IF NOT THE MAJOR
PROBLEM, IS THAT THEY PUT EVERYTHING IN THAT THEY THINK IS
PAPER, EVEN THOUGH ITS WOOD CONTENT IS LOW OR IT'S GOT ALL
KINDS OF ADDITIVES. AND JUST A SMALL EDUCATION WOULD
ENLIGHTEN AN AWFUL LOT OF PEOPLE, LIKE, OH, MAYBE NEWSPAPERS
MEANS JUST THAT, NEWSPAPERS.

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT. ABSOLUTELY. ANYTHING -YOU KNOW, IT'S AMAZING, YOU TELL PEOPLE ANYTHING THAT COMES
IN THIS NEWSPAPER CAN BE RECYCLED IN A NEWSPAPER PROGRAM.
BUT THAT'S IT. I MEAN, THAT'S THE EXTENT, THAT'S THE LIMIT
OF WHAT CAN BE RECYCLED IN THAT PROGRAM, SO.

2.2

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS?

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST -
CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: -- ONE QUICK QUESTION ON THE -- NOT EVEN A QUESTION, JUST A STATEMENT. ON THE GARDENING PROGRAM, WHILE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT KIDS IN SCHOOL LEARNING ABOUT COMPOSTING, LEARNING ABOUT THOSE TYPES OF ISSUES, I THINK THAT'S ANOTHER PIECE OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM THAT'S NECESSARY.

WE ARE -- THERE WAS AN ARTICLE IN THE
"SACRAMENTO BEE" YESTERDAY ABOUT RECYCLING AND LANDFILL
CAPACITY. THERE ARE GOING TO BE MORE AND MORE DISCUSSIONS
ABOUT LANDFILL CAPACITY AND THE GLUT OF LANDFILL CAPACITY.

THE MORE WE DO TO EDUCATE PEOPLE IN THE BENEFITS OF

SUSTAINABILITY, COMPOSTING, RECYCLING, THOSE TYPES OF

THINGS, ARE ONLY GOING TO BE OF BENEFIT TO THIS SOCIETY. SO

I THINK THAT THIS IS AN APPROPRIATE PLACE, WHENEVER YOU CAN

EDUCATE THE KIDS ON THE BENEFIT THAT THEY GET.

AND, YOU KNOW, IT'S LIKE THE -- I KNOW IT GOT PULLED, IT'S GOING TO BE DONE OUT OF RMDZ MONEY, BUT THE CAMP ARROYO ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER, I MEAN, THAT'S GOING TO BE ABLE TO -- THAT'S GOING TO BE A SHOWPLACE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF MATERIALS THAT CAN BE USED IN BUILDING THAT'S GOING TO GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS MAKING PEOPLE AWARE OF JUST HOW MUCH BENEFIT THERE IS. AND IT'S GOOD WE'RE GETTING THAT MONEY OUT OF RMDZ INSTEAD OF THIS MONEY. SO, THEY'VE GOT TO WAIT A COUPLE OF WEEKS, BUT IT MAKES SENSE.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'M PREPARED TO MAKE A MOTION IF YOU ARE READY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES, SIR.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. I'LL MOVE

TO FUND THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS: 200,000 TO AUGMENT THE

EXISTING MANDATORY INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE DEPARTMENT

OF FINANCE FOR AUDIT SERVICES; 195,000 TO ENTER INTO AN

INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TO EXPAND THEIR "GARDEN IN EVERY SCHOOL" GRANTS PROGRAM; 5,000 TO EXPAND THE BOARD'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE FAIR; 87,000 FOR AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES TO IMPLEMENT A PILOT ILLEGAL DUMPING PREVENTION PROGRAM; 175,000 TO ENTER INTO AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TO ASSIST IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A LOCAL BUY RECYCLING AND WASTE DIVERSION ORDINANCE; 75,000 TO ENTER INTO AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF L.A. TO PERFORM A STUDY AND INITIATE AN EDUCATION CAMPAIGN TO IMPROVE THEIR COMMINGLED COLLECTION SYSTEM; 25,000 TO ENTER INTO AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE SLUG PROJECT. MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL SECOND THAT. CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHTY. MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND MR. JONES SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT --MEMBER PENNINGTON: I WANT YOU TO KNOW --CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M SORRY. MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- THAT I SPEND MONEY JUST LIKE A LIBERAL. MEMBER ROBERTI: THAT'S WHAT SOME OF THE CONSERVATIVES IN YOUR PARTY HAVE ACCUSED YOU OF. CHAIRMAN EATON: -- THAT WE ADOPT RESOLUTION -- AS

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

AND I THANK YOU, MR. PENNINGTON, FOR GOING

IDENTIFIED FOR THE PROJECTS SET FORTH.

THROUGH THOSE ONE BY ONE, IT'LL HELP EACH OF US.

MADAM SECRETARY, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

MEMBER JONES: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI?

MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE.

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

CHAIRMAN EATON: NEXT IS THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

14 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL MOVE

15 ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR.

16 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. ONE MOMENT,

17 MR. PENNINGTON.

JUST A POINT OF CLARIFICATION, SINCE THE
MEETING IS BROKEN UP INTO TWO DAYS, IF YOU REMEMBER THE LAST
TIME WE HAD THIS SITUATION ARISE WHERE IN ORDER TO BE ABLE
TO ALLOW INDIVIDUALS WHO MAY OR MAY NOT WANT TO COME FORWARD
AND COMMENT ON IT, WE CANNOT ADOPT -- WE CANNOT AND SHOULD
NOT ADOPT THOSE ITEMS THAT ARE SCHEDULED FOR THE SECOND DAY

OF THE BOARD MEETING.

THOSE ITEMS -- IF I CAN JUST GO THROUGH WHAT
THE CONSENT CALENDAR IS, AND THEN GO THROUGH THE CONSENT
CALENDAR FOR EACH DAY THAT WE CAN ADOPT. THE CONSENT
CALENDAR AS PROPOSED WOULD BE ITEMS 13, 14(A), 15(A), ITEMS
21 THROUGH 28. ITEMS 13, 14(A) AND 15(A) ARE ELIGIBLE FOR
TODAY'S CONSENT CALENDAR.

SO I WOULD BE WILLING TO --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. I'LL --

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- WITH THAT CAVEAT, GO THROUGH -

10 -

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- AMEND MY MOTION HERE, AND MOVE WE ADOPT A CONSENT CALENDAR CONSISTING OF ITEMS 13, 14(A) AND 15(A).

IS THAT CORRECT?

CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT'S CORRECT.

MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND.

17 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND

MR. JONES SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT THE CONSENT CALENDAR

19 CONSISTING OF ITEMS 13, 14(A)

20 AND 15(A).

MADAM SECRETARY, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

MEMBER JONES: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI? MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE. THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON? CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE. VII. NEW BUSINESS AGENDA ITEMS CHAIRMAN EATON: ANOTHER POINT OF INFORMATION, 8 ITEMS NO. 5, 6, 7 AND 8 HAVE BEEN REQUESTED TO BE PULLED FROM TODAY'S AGENDA. 10 MEMBER JONES: WHAT ABOUT 11? CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. 2 --11 12 MEMBER JONES: IS 11 BEING PULLED? CHAIRMAN EATON: I HAVE NOT GOT --13 14 MEMBER JONES: MAYBE NOT. OKAY. 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES, YOU MAY BE RIGHT, I'LL GET SOME CLARIFICATION FROM THE STAFF. I'VE 16 17 GOT TWO DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS, I'VE GOT A DOCUMENT THAT --18 PERHAPS MS. NAUMAN CAN GO THROUGH --19 MS. NAUMAN: THE QUESTION WAS ON ITEM 20 NO. 11? 21 MEMBER JONES: YEAH. 2.2 MS. NAUMAN: THAT ITEM HAS BEEN PULLED, THE APPLICANT ACTUALLY DID NOT DECIDE TO PROCEED WITH THE 23 APPLICATION THROUGH THE LEA. 24

MEMBER JONES: OKAY. SO 11 HAS BEEN PULLED.

MS. NAUMAN: IT HAS BEEN PULLED. ACTUALLY, IT WILL NOT COME BACK BEFORE YOU.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: SO ITEMS 5, 6, 7, 8

AND 11 ARE NO LONGER....

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

PERMITTING, LEA AND FACILITY COMPLIANCE:

AGENDA ITEM 2: CONSIDERATION OF PROGRESS MADE BY INYO

COUNTY INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AS LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY

FOR INYO COUNTY SINCE MARCH 23, 1999

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. 2.

MR. ABOUSHANAB: GOOD MORNING CHAIRMAN EATON AND BOARD MEMBERS, MY NAME IS GABE ABOUSHANAB OF THE LEA EVALUATIONS UNIT. THIS ITEM BEFORE YOU TODAY PRESENTS PROGRESS MADE BY INYO COUNTY INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY OVERSIGHT SINCE THE MARCH 23RD BOARD MEETING.

IF YOU REMEMBER, THE LAST BOARD MEETING IN MARCH OF THIS YEAR THE BOARD CONSIDERED ESSENTIALLY FOUR ITEMS, JURISDICTIONAL COMPLIANCE PROGRESS SINCE THE LEA'S PROBATIONARY STATUS INITIATED IN MARCH OF 1997 AND ITS SUBSEQUENT EXTENSIONS, THE LEA'S PERFORMANCE IN CAUSING PROGRESS TOWARDS COMPLIANCE DURING THE MENTIONED PERIOD, AND

OF COURSE, COUNTY REPRESENTATIVE PROPOSALS BEFORE THE BOARD IN MARCH WHICH WERE AIMED AT RESOLVING OUTSTANDING COMPLIANCE TASKS, AND STATUTORY OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO THE BOARD PURSUANT TO PRC SECTIONS 43214, -215, AND -216.5.

THESE CONSIDERATIONS RESULTED IN BOARD

DECISION TO ASSUME ENFORCEMENT RESPONSIBILITY FROM THE INYO

COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, THE ACTION ON

THIS DECISION TO BE EFFECTIVE ON JULY 1ST, 1999. AT THAT

TIME BOARD ASKED STAFF TO PROVIDE A JUNE AGENDA ITEM

DESCRIBING JURISDICTIONAL COMPLIANCE PROGRESS SINCE MARCH.

2.2

2.3

THE JUNE PROGRESS ITEM TODAY IS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE THE BOARD WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAINTAIN OR MODIFY ITS DECISION IN MARCH OF 1999. THAT'S RESOLUTION 1999-75.

IF I MAY DIRECT THE MEMBERS' ATTENTION TO THE ATTACHMENTS FOLLOWING PAGE 2-4, I WILL BEGIN WITH THE TABLES WHICH WERE PROVIDED ESSENTIALLY BACK IN MARCH AND MODIFIED FOR THIS ITEM.

YOU WILL NOTICE PAGE ONE IS FOR BISHOP

SUNLAND, AND AT THAT TIME WE HAD THE RDSI, THE CLOSURE PLAN,

AND THE SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT REVISION WAS RECEIVED IN

OCTOBER OF '98. BUT YOU NOTICE THE ASTERISK REFERS TO A

LEASE AGREEMENT PENDING. I'M HAPPY TO REPORT TO YOU TODAY

THAT SIGNED RELEASE AGREEMENTS BY L.A. DEPARTMENT OF WATER

AND POWER EXIST AND HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED FOR BISHOP

SUNLAND. SO THAT MEANS BISHOP SUNLAND IS READY AND POISED TO GO BEFORE THE BOARD FOR PERMIT REVISION FAIRLY SOON HERE. SO THIS SITE IS PRETTY MUCH COMPLETE AS FAR AS OUTSTANDING TASKS FOR COMPLIANCE.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO MENTION THAT THE SIGNED LEASE AGREEMENTS AFFECT TWO OTHER SITES WHICH WE WILL GO INTO LATER, INDEPENDENCE AND LONE PINE WERE ALSO AFFECTED BY THE LEASE AGREEMENT, AND THAT'S BEEN DONE.

I WOULD LIKE TO ALSO MENTION THAT THE SITING ELEMENT THAT WAS OUTSTANDING BACK IN FEBRUARY WAS RECEIVED BY BOARD STAFF IN JUNE, IT WAS DUE JUNE 15, AND THAT'S BEEN ACCOMPLISHED TOO FOR INYO COUNTY.

2.2

IF I MAY DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE TWO,
THE LONE PINE LANDFILL. THERE WERE THREE OUTSTANDING ITEMS
AND THEY WERE TERMED TO BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME THE AGENDA
WAS PUT TOGETHER. THAT WAS THE RDSI, THE CLOSURE PLAN, AND
THE DRAFT SOLID WASTE PERMIT. TO DATE THEY HAVEN'T BEEN
SUBMITTED TO THE LEA.

FOR INDEPENDENCE LANDFILL, ON THE NEXT PAGE,
WE HAD AGAIN THREE OUTSTANDING ITEMS, THE RDSI, THE CLOSURE
PLAN AND THE REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT. I'M HAPPY
TO REPORT TODAY THAT THE CLOSURE PLAN HAS BEEN SUBMITTED.

AND IF WE MOVE TO PAGE FOUR OF THE ATTACHMENTS, THE SHOSHONE LANDFILL, IF YOU RECALL, THE

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR PROPOSED A SCHEDULE AND THE BOARD

ACCEPTED IT, AND IT WAS DUE JULY 31ST, AND THAT DATE HAS NOT

PASSED SO ESSENTIALLY THERE'S NO NONCOMPLIANCE FOR SHOSHONE.

AND SIMILARLY, IF WE GO TO PAGE FIVE FOR THE TECOPA LANDFILL, WE'VE GOT THE RDSI, THE CLOSURE PLAN, AND THE DRAFT REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT DUE ON JUNE 30, 1999, WHICH ESSENTIALLY HASN'T LAPSED YET. SO WE ARE --AGAIN, THEY'RE NOT OUTSTANDING.

I WOULD LIKE TO SUMMARIZE BRIEFLY A

CONVERSATION WITH THE LEA AS OF YESTERDAY AFTERNOON. AND HE

REPORTS TO ME THAT BASED ON CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN HIMSELF

AND THE CONSULTANT, INDEPENDENCE, SHOSHONE AND TECOPA

OUTSTANDING DOCUMENTS WHICH I JUST DESCRIBED ARE PROMISED TO

BE IN THE LEA'S HANDS TOMORROW, ON JUNE 23RD, AND THE LONE

PINE OUTSTANDING DOCUMENTS ARE PROMISED TO BE IN THE LEA'S

HANDS ON JUNE 28TH.

AND THAT ESSENTIALLY CONCLUDES MY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS TO DATE. AND I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER QUESTIONS, OR TURN TO SHARON ANDERSON WHO MAY WANT TO SPEAK, AT YOUR PLEASURE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS?

MR. JONES, I KNOW THAT THIS HAS BEEN A LABOR

23 OF LOVE, OR A LOVE OF LABOR.

MEMBER JONES: A LOVE OF LABOR.

CHAIRMAN EATON: YOU'VE BEEN VERY INVOLVED WITH

THIS COUNTY IN TRYING TO BRING THEM INTO COMPLIANCE, AS WELL

AS SORT OF, YOU KNOW, WORKING WITH THEM TO SHOW THEM HOW

THEY CAN DO THINGS BETTER IN A VERY UNIQUE SITUATION.

MEMBER JONES: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE TO TELL YOU, I'M PLEASED WITH WHAT THE COUNTY'S DONE, BECAUSE WE ACTUALLY GAVE THEM TILL JUNE 30TH, SO AS A WAY THAT -- YOU KNOW, OUR JUNE MEETING IS JUNE 23RD, THEY HAVE ANOTHER SEVEN DAYS TO ACTUALLY GET THESE IN.

I'VE TALKED TO MIKE, WHO IS THE

P&E PERSON INVOLVED WITH THIS. HE RECEIVED A FAX OF A -- A

COPY OF A PERMIT WHICH, CAN'T ACCEPT IT BUT AT LEAST IT'S

DONE. I MEAN, THEY'VE GOT TO HARD-MAIL A COPY TO US.

I THINK WHAT WE WANTED TO DO HERE WAS GET
THIS COUNTY INTO COMPLIANCE. THEY HAD TREMENDOUS OBSTACLES
DEALING WITH L.A. POWER AND WATER, TRYING TO GET LEASE
AGREEMENTS. THAT'S DONE.

THEY'RE IN COMPLIANCE OTHER THAN A LITTER

ISSUE AT A PLACE WHERE -- RURAL CALIFORNIA, WHERE THE GUY IN

CHARGE WENT ON VACATION, DIDN'T TELL ANYBODY, THEY HAD WIND

BLOWING, THEY HAD LITTER, THEY'VE GOT TO GO IN AND CLEAN IT

UP. TYPICAL -- NOT TYPICAL, BUT TYPICAL FOR INYO.

I THINK WE HAVE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE FACT THAT THEY'VE DONE WHAT WE ASKED THEM TO DO, TO KEEP THEM ON A

COMPLIANCE SCHEDULE. *INAUDIBLE TO HOLD THEIR FEET TO THE FIRE FOR THOSE THREE DOCUMENTS OR NINE DOCUMENTS THAT THEY'VE SAID ARE SUPPOSED TO BE IN, IN TWO DAYS, AND THEN FOUR DAYS.

I'M PREPARED TO REMOVE OUR

DELEGATION OF -- AS LEA. AND IF THEY DO NOT SHOW UP THEN IT WILL BE -- IF THOSE THINGS DON'T SHOW UP IN FOUR DAYS, WHICH THEY'VE GOT -- THEY HAVE UNTIL THE 30TH TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH OUR ORDER -- IF THEY'RE NOT IN BY THE 28TH OR BY THE 30TH, SCHEDULE AN ITEM FOR JULY WHERE WE TAKE OVER EVERYTHING IN THAT COUNTY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

BUT I -- I HONESTLY THINK THEY'RE GOING TO BE THERE. THEY FAXED THE COPIES. SO I THINK WE NEED TO REMOVE OUR OVERSIGHT AS LEA AND REESTABLISH THAT JURISDICTION AS THE LEA.

MEMBER ROBERTI: SO AGAIN, REFRESH ME, WHAT ARE THEY NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH?

MEMBER JONES: THEY'RE IN COMPLIANCE

ON ALL OF THE OPERATIONAL ISSUES. THEY HAD SOME RDSI -
THEY HAD SOME PERMIT PAPERWORK THINGS THAT HAD TO BE TURNED

IN BY JUNE 30TH. THEY'VE TURNED -- THEY'VE FAXED SOME IN,

THEY'VE SAID

THAT -- THE CONSULTANT THAT'S DOING IT HAS TOLD THE COUNTY

24 THAT THEY'LL GET DELIVERY ON TWO OF THE SITES --

MR. ABOUSHANAB: THREE TOMORROW.

MEMBER JONES: THREE OF THE SITES TOMORROW, AND THE REST ON THE 28TH. THEY HAVE UNTIL THE 30TH TO BE IN COMPLIANCE.

AS FAR AS THE OPERATIONAL ISSUES

THAT -- THEY WERE VERY BROAD. WE'VE BEEN DEALING WITH THIS

FOR TWO YEARS. THEY'VE FENCED THE SITES, THEY'VE PUT IN

SECURITY, THEY'VE TAKEN CARE OF LITTER, THEY'VE TAKEN CARE

OF COVER. THEY WENT OUT AND GOT THE MACHINERY. THEY

BROUGHT THE FACILITIES INTO COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATE

MINIMUM STANDARDS, WHICH WAS A HUGE UNDERTAKING FOR THEM.

MEMBER ROBERTI: AND IF FOR SOME REASON THEY'RE NOT IN COMPLIANCE BY THE 30TH WE CAN RESCHEDULE THE JULY MEETING?

MEMBER JONES: ABSOLUTELY.

MEMBER ROBERTI: OKAY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT WOULD BE THE 27TH I BELIEVE.

THAT WOULD BE SUFFICIENT UNDER THE NOTICING PROVISION.

MS. ANDERSON: SHARON ANDERSON OF THE LEA SUPPORT SERVICES BRANCH. I'D LIKE TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO THE RESOLUTION WHICH WE CRAFTED CRAFTILY TO ALLOW FOR FLEXIBILITY IN YOUR DECISION.

IF YOU ARE READY TO TAKE A LOOK AND MOVE, YOU WILL SEE ON THE FOURTH "WHEREAS" THAT YOU CAN CHOOSE ONE OR

THE OTHER. AND THE FIRST ONE WOULD BE THE DIRECTION THAT YOU SEEM TO BE HEADING.

AND THEN THE "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,"

THERE ARE THREE SELECTIONS THERE THAT YOU CAN CHOOSE FROM.

AND IT APPEARS AS THOUGH THE SECOND ONE MIGHT BE THE ONE

APPROPRIATE AT THIS TIME.

MEMBER JONES: I'LL LET EVERYBODY READ AND THEN I'LL MAKE A MOTION.

MR. CHAIRMAN?

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

10 CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES, I THINK EVERYONE'S
11 READY TO --

MEMBER JONES: OKAY, I'D LIKE TO MOVE RESOLUTION 1999-261, AND THE FOURTH "WHEREAS" WOULD BE:

"WHEREAS, THE INYO COUNTY LEA HAS BEEN FOUND
TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH STIPULATIONS AGREED UPON
IN THEIR WORK PLAN AND AT THE MARCH 23RD WASTE
BOARD MEETING."

AND THEN THE: "NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED TO RESCIND CIWMB RESOLUTION 1999-75 AND MONITOR ADDITIONAL PROGRESS OF THE LEA."

MEMBER PENNINGTON: DO YOU WANT TO SAY ANYTHING ABOUT THE 30TH OR NOT?

MEMBER JONES: I DON'T KNOW IF WE NEED -- I THINK
24 PUT IN -- YEAH -- IN THE RESOLUTION, SO IT WOULD BE "TO

RESCIND THE RESOLUTION AND MONITOR ADDITIONAL PROGRESS OF THE LEA DEPENDING UPON," AND THEN:

"... BASED ON COMPLIANCE BY JUNE 30TH IF
INYO COUNTY HAS NOT COMPLIED THE ITEM WILL COME
BACK IN THE JULY MEETING FOR THE BOARD TO TAKE
OVER ALL OF THE LEA ACTIVITIES IN INYO COUNTY."

CHAIRMAN EATON: YOU GUYS ARE GOING TO MAKE IT

HARD FOR ME TO HAVE TO REPEAT THAT, HOLD ON A SECOND AND LET

ME SEE IF I CAN'T TRY AND....

MEMBER JONES: YOU WANT TO JUST MAKE SURE YOU GET

CHAIRMAN EATON: LET ME -- MR. JONES, IF I COULD

JUST ASK YOU FOR THE TIME BEING JUST TO WITHDRAW YOUR MOTION

AND LET ME JUST PUT IN A SUBSTITUTE MOTION, IF I MAY?

MEMBER JONES: SURE.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. IN THE CLAUSE WHICH READS "WHEREAS, THE INYO COUNTY LEA HAS BEEN FOUND TO," I WOULD HAVE THE FOLLOWING:

"BE IN SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH

STIPULATIONS AGREED UPON IN THEIR WORK PLAN AND AT

THE MARCH 23RD MEETING. THERE REMAIN A FEW

OUTSTANDING ISSUES IN ORDER TO BE IN FULL

COMPLIANCE BY JUNE 30TH. WE HAVE BEEN ASSURED

THAT THOSE ITEMS WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD BY

JUNE 30TH IN ORDER FOR THEM TO BE IN FULL COMPLIANCE. IF THESE ITEMS ARE NOT RECEIVED BY JUNE 30TH THIS ITEM AND THE ISSUE OF COMPLIANCE WILL BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE BOARD AT THE JULY MEETING." MEMBER JONES: OKAY. I'LL SECOND YOUR AMENDED MOTION. CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. AND THAT WOULD ALSO INCLUDE --10 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) 11 MS. NAUMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD YOU JUST CLARIFY 12 FOR US WHERE YOU BEGIN THE LANGUAGE THAT'S IN THE RESOLVE CLAUSE? I WAS WITH YOU WITH --13 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: I HAVEN'T EVEN GOTTEN TO THE 15 RESOLVE CLAUSE. MS. NAUMAN: ALL RIGHT, THAT ALL GOES IN THE LAST 16 17 "WHEREAS." 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: WHEREAS. MS. NAUMAN: THANK YOU. 19

CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT'S MAYBE WHY WE COULDN'T FIND

IT QUITE YET, BECAUSE IT HADN'T GOTTEN THERE, AND IT ISN'T
- I WAS STILL IN THE "WHEREAS."

BUT WITH REGARD TO THE RESOLVED ISSUE, THAT
WOULD BE, AS MR. JONES HAD PREVIOUSLY STATED: "RESCIND

20

21

2.2

CIWMB RESOLUTION 1999-75 AND MONITOR ADDITIONAL PROGRESS OF THE LEA." OKAY. MR. EATON MOVES AND MR. JONES --MEMBER ROBERTI: WHAT ABOUT THE RESOLVE CLAUSE --CHAIRMAN EATON: THE RESOLVE CLAUSE IS WHAT MR. JONES HAD MENTIONED, IT WOULD BE SECOND, WHICH IS: "RESCIND CIWMB RESOLUTION 1999-75 AND MONITOR ADDITIONAL PROGRESS OF THE LEA." 10 MR. EATON MOVES AND MR. JONES SECONDS THE 11 ADOPTION OF -- RESOLUTION 1999-261, AS AMENDED, BE ADOPTED. 12 MADAM SECRETARY, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL. THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES? 13 14 MEMBER JONES: AYE. 15 THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON? MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. 16 17 THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI? MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE. 18 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON? 19 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE. 21 AGENDA ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO THE 2.2 REGULATIONS FOR THE STORAGE OF WASTE TIRES 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: MS. NAUMAN, ITEM NO. 3. 24 MS. NAUMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, ITEM NO. 3

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

IS CONSIDERATION OF REVISIONS TO THE REGULATIONS FOR THE STORAGE OF WASTE TIRES. LET ME JUST PROVIDE A FEW INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS ABOUT THIS ITEM, AND THEN I'LL ASK BERNIE VLACH ON OUR STAFF TO PRESENT THE ITEM IN MORE DETAIL.

THIS ITEM ADDRESSES AN ACTION THAT THIS BOARD TOOK ON JANUARY 29TH OF LAST YEAR. THE INTENT, AND WHAT WE'RE BRINGING FORWARD TO YOU THIS MORNING, IS TO MAKE PERMANENT IN REGULATIONS THE REPEAT OF THREE WASTE TIRE STORAGE EXCLUSIONS THAT WERE REPEALED BY YOUR ACTION IN EMERGENCY REGULATIONS. THOSE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS HAVE BEEN EXTENDED, I THINK, TWICE AND ARE NOW DUE TO EXPIRE IN JULY OF THIS YEAR, I BELIEVE ON THE 1ST, WHICH IS NEXT FRIDAY.

2.2

WE RECOGNIZE THAT THROUGH THE TIRE REPORT THE BOARD IS EXAMINING A NUMBER OF POTENTIAL CHANGES TO THE TIRE PROGRAM, SOME OF WHICH MAY NECESSITATE REGULATORY ACTION, AND THAT YOU'LL BE TAKING ACTION ON THOSE ITEMS SOMETIME IN THE FUTURE.

WE'RE BRINGING THIS TIRE REGULATION ITEM

BEFORE YOU TODAY IN ADVANCE OF YOUR CONSIDERATION OF THOSE

BROADER RANGE OF ISSUES SIMPLY DUE TO TIMING.

IF YOU CHOOSE TO APPROVE SUBMITTAL OF THIS
PACKAGE TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW THE REPEAL OF

THE EXCLUSIONS WILL REMAIN IN PLACE. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF
YOU CHOOSE NOT TO REMOVE THE -- EXCUSE ME, NOT TO MOVE THE
PACKAGE FORWARD AND WERE UNABLE TO GET ANOTHER EXTENSION OF
THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS, THE THREE REPEALED EXCLUSIONS
WILL AUTOMATICALLY BECOME OPERATIVE AGAIN ON JULY 1ST, WHICH
WE BELIEVE IS AN UNDESIRABLE SITUATION.

SO, THAT KIND OF GIVES YOU THE CONTEXT OF WHY WE'RE HERE. AGAIN, IT'S FOR TIMING REASONS ONLY, WE ARE NOT TRYING TO GET AHEAD OF THE TIRE REPORT. OBVIOUSLY THIS PACKAGE IS BEFORE YOU FOR, YOU KNOW, YOUR MODIFICATION IF YOU SO CHOOSE. BUT, FROM A STAFF PERSPECTIVE, WE'RE LIMITING OUR RECOMMENDATION TO YOU THIS MORNING JUST TO THE EXCLUSIONS THAT HAVE BEEN REPEALED.

2.2

SO, WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO ASK BERNIE IF HE WILL GO AHEAD AND GIVE YOU AN EXPLANATION OF WHAT THOSE ITEMS ARE THAT WE'RE ADDRESSING THIS MORNING.

MR. VLACH: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS
OF THE BOARD. MY NAME IS BERNIE VLACH, REPRESENTING THE
BOARD'S PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION.

AS MS. NAUMAN MENTIONED, THE EXCLUSIONS -THE ACTION OF THE BOARD WAS TAKEN IN JANUARY OF 1998. THE
REASON THE BOARD TOOK THE EMERGENCY ACTION WAS THE INCREASED
USE OF CERTAIN EXCLUSIONS FOR STOCKPILING WASTE TIRES TO
AVOID PERMIT REQUIREMENTS, FINANCIAL ASSURANCE, AND STORAGE

STANDARDS. THIS RESULTED IN SOME DOCUMENTED CASES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS IN THE STATE.

ONCE THE EXCLUSIONS WERE ISSUED THEY WERE

VERY DIFFICULT TO REVOKE, IT INVOLVED COUNTING SPECIFIC

TIRES AT FACILITIES, KNOWING WHEN CERTAIN TIRES CAME IN, AND

WHEN CERTAIN TIRES LEFT. IT WAS VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE.

ON JUNE 16TH, 1998, THE GENERAL EXCLUSION AND THE INDOOR STORAGE EXCLUSION WERE REPEALED FROM REGULATION.

AND THE RECYCLING BUSINESS EXCLUSION WAS AMENDED TO RESTRICT ITS APPLICABILITY TO TIRE RETREADERS, AND THIS WAS AS AUTHORIZED BY STATUTE.

2.2

THE EMERGENCY ACTION OF THE BOARD LAST

JANUARY AFFECTED 65 WASTE TIRE FACILITIES. THEY WERE

NOTIFIED OF THE CHANGE AND THEY WERE TOLD TO EITHER OBTAIN A

PERMIT OR TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF TIRES TO BELOW 500. SINCE

THAT TIME ALL BUT 17 OF THE FACILITIES HAVE COMPLIED, AND

STAFF IS WORKING WITH THE OPERATORS USING AVAILABLE

ENFORCEMENT TOOLS TO TRY TO BRING THEM IN COMPLIANCE.

BECAUSE OF STAFF'S CONCERN THAT THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS MAY EXPIRE, STAFF RECOMMENDS ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 1999-278, AUTHORIZING FINAL REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE EXCLUSIONS FROM PERMITTING AND OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR WASTE TIRE FACILITIES.

AND THIS CONCLUDES STAFF'S PRESENTATION, AND

JULIE AND I WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU MAY HAVE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS FOR

MS. NAUMAN OR MR. VLACH?

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: DO YOU HAVE SPEAKERS ON THEIR SIDE?

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES, WE HAVE SEVERAL SPEAKERS.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY, NEVER MIND THEN, I'LL HOLD.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I'D JUST LIKE TO ASK ONE

PROCEDURAL QUESTION. WHAT IS THE PROCESS FOR SEEKING

12 APPROVAL OF THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS? YOU MENTIONED IN

YOUR PRELIMINARY REMARKS THAT THERE IS AN APPROVAL PROCESS,

AND SO IF YOU CAN GIVE ME THE TIMING OF THAT, AND WHO MAKES

THAT DECISION.

10

11

13

14

15

20

2.2

16 MS. NAUMAN: ACTUALLY, I THINK I'LL DEFER TO MR.

17 BLOCK, IF HE WILL, ON THE ACTUAL OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE

18 LAW PROCEDURES.

19 CHAIRMAN EATON: WE HAD TWO OF THEM HERE AND BOTH

OF THEM LOOKED IN FEAR, SO I WENT TO THE FAR LEFT. OKAY, I

21 JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT WAS....

MR. BLOCK: EMERGENCY REGULATIONS ARE -- ONCE

23 THEY'RE ADOPTED BY THE BOARD ARE SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF

24 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. THEY HAVE 10 CALENDAR DAYS TO APPROVE

OR DISAPPROVE THOSE, AS OPPOSED TO THE 30 WORKING DAYS WITH A NORMAL PACKAGE.

ONCE APPROVED THEY'RE VALID FOR 120 DAYS.

AND THEN ACTUALLY THERE ISN'T A, QUOTE/UNQUOTE, "EXTENSION PROCEDURE," IF YOU WILL. WHAT OAL ACTUALLY MAKES US DO IS RESUBMIT EVERY TIME. WE USUALLY REFER TO IT AS AN EXTENSION, THEY ALWAYS REMINDED US THAT'S NOT WHAT IT'S CALLED.

THERE ISN'T ANY -- ESSENTIALLY THEY'RE

REVIEWING THEM BRAND-NEW, AS IF THERE'S STILL A NEED FOR THE

EMERGENCY, SO THE POTENTIAL PROBLEM IF YOU ASK FOR A NUMBER

OF EMERGENCIES IS THAT THEY MAY SAY, WELL, IF IT WAS SUCH AN

EMERGENCY, YOU KNOW, WHY HAS THIS TAKEN SO LONG.

TYPICALLY WHAT THEY HAVE DONE IN THE PAST IS
THEY WILL LOOK TO SEE WHETHER, IN OUR CASE, THE BOARD HAS
BEEN MAKING PROGRESS TOWARDS MAKING THOSE REGULATIONS
PERMANENT, AND IF THEY SEE SOME PROGRESS, REGULATORY ACTION
BEING TAKEN, AND THERE'S JUST OTHER DELAYS THAT ARE SLOWING
IT DOWN, THEY TYPICALLY WILL DEFER TO THE AGENCIES, OUR
BOARD'S JUDGMENT AS TO WHETHER THE EMERGENCIES ARE STILL
APPROPRIATE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU.

MEMBER JONES: I DO HAVE A QUESTION FOR ELLIOT,

24 MR. CHAIRMAN.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: THESE EMERGENCY REGS,

ONE OF THE OUTCOMES IN THE ITEM WERE THAT THERE WERE 17

FACILITIES THAT WERE STILL UNDER SOME FORM OF ENFORCEMENT

ACTION, AND I'M ASSUMING, AS I HEARD FROM STAFF, THOSE ARE

USED TIRE DEALERS THAT ARE IN THAT POSITION. RIGHT?

MALE VOICE: SOME OF THEM.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER JONES: SOME OF THEM.

AND THESE EMERGENCY REGS WHICH ARE GOING TO PRECEDE WHAT OUR AB 117 PROGRAM IS DOING, WE HAVE A DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRES, WE HAVE TWO DEFINITIONS OF WASTE TIRES, ONE INCLUDES USED TIRES, ONE DOESN'T.

WHAT DO WE DO TO THIS PACKET IF WE INCLUDE

THE LANGUAGE FOR A DEFINITION OF A WASTE TIRE THAT'S IN OUR

AB 117 DEFINITIONS? WHICH MEANS -- WHICH SAYS:

"A WASTE TIRE MEANS A TIRE THAT'S NO LONGER
MOUNTED ON A VEHICLE AND IS NO LONGER SUITABLE FOR
USE ON A HIGHWAY DUE TO WEAR, DAMAGE, DEFECT OR
DEVIATION FROM THE MANUFACTURER'S ORIGINAL
SPECIFICATIONS. WASTE TIRES INCLUDE REPAIRABLE
TIRES, SCRAP TIRES AND USED TIRES NOT STORED IN
COMPLIANCE WITH STATE MINIMUM STANDARDS APPLICABLE
TO USED TIRES AND ALTERED TIRES. WASTE TIRES DO
NOT INCLUDE USED TIRES, TIRE-DERIVED PRODUCTS, OR

GRANULATED RUBBER."

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

TO INCLUDE THAT DEFINITION IN THESE EMERGENCY REGS, SINCE THEY'RE NOT CONTINUATIONS, SINCE THEY ARE NOT EXTENSIONS -- WOULD WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO INCLUDE THESE SINCE THESE WOULD GET LOOKED AT FRESH EACH TIME?

MR. BLOCK: ALL RIGHT, I SEE.

MEMBER JONES: BECAUSE MY PROBLEM IS WE HAVE 17

PEOPLE THAT ARE OUT OF COMPLIANCE. IF WE GO THROUGH OUR AB

117 WORK WE'RE -- THOSE PEOPLE AREN'T GOING TO BE OUT OF

COMPLIANCE.

SO, WHY NOT DEAL WITH IT IN THESE REGS, IF
IT'S NOT AN ENFORCEMENT ISSUE? AND WHEN I GOT BRIEFED WITH
P&E STAFF, BERNIE AND EVERYBODY ENSURED ME THAT THIS SHOULD
NOT BE -- THIS SHOULD NOT ADD TO AN ENFORCEMENT PROBLEM,
BECAUSE IF IT DID THEN I WOULD HAVE A DIFFERENT VIEW. BUT
IF IT DOESN'T THEN BUREAUCRATICALLY, IF WE'RE GOING TO
CHANGE THIS IN SIX MONTHS OR A YEAR, WHY PUT THEM THROUGH
THE IDEA OF HAVING TO PUT UP CLOSURE, POST-CLOSURE FUNDING
NOW, WHEN IN SIX MONTHS THEY'RE GOING TO BE LEGAL. IT
DOESN'T MAKE ANY SENSE TO ME.

BUT, I'D LIKE TO KNOW IF WE CAN INCLUDE THAT DEFINITION.

MR. CHANDLER: WELL, LET ME SPEAK TO THAT IN ONE REGARD. I CERTAINLY THINK THE BOARD HAS THE PREROGATIVE, IN

THIS SETTING, TO EXAMINE YOUR ISSUE.

MY CONCERN IS, IS THAT I WAS HANDED TODAY

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE MAY 25TH, 1999, VERSION OF THE FINAL

AB 117 REPORT. AND AS YOU JUST READ OFF YOUR DEFINITION,

IT'S NOT CONSISTENT WITH WHAT WE'RE GOING TO BE TAKING UP

SHORTLY WITH REGARD TO THE DEFINITION OF A WASTE TIRE.

AND MY ISSUE IS, IS THAT THERE HAS BEEN SO MUCH CONCERN OVER WHAT IS THE APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF A WASTE TIRE AND HOW IT READS, THAT BEFORE WE GET TO YOUR SPECIFIC QUESTION OF HOW WOULD THESE REGULATIONS BE IMPACTED, IF YOU WILL, BY CHANGING THE DEFINITION -- SO I THINK I'M WITH YOU ON WHERE YOU WANT TO GO, I'M CONCERNED THAT THE TRANSCRIPT'S GOING TO SHOW A DEFINITION THAT YOU JUST ASKED US TO CONSIDER THAT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE DEFINITION THAT THIS BOARD IS GOING TO BE ASKED TO TAKE UP SHORTLY WHEN IT REVIEWS THE TIRE REPORT.

FOR EXAMPLE, THE PHRASE "USED TIRE" I SEE IS STRUCK. AS WASTE TIRES INCLUDE REPAIRABLE TIRES, SCRAP TIRES AND ALTERED WASTE TIRES, WASTE TIRES DO NOT INCLUDE USED TIRES.

SO MY ONLY POINT IS, IS THAT THIS BUSINESS

ABOUT WHAT IS A WASTE TIRE, WHAT'S A USED TIRE -- WE'VE GOT

TO GET THE DEFINITION CLEAR FOR EVERYBODY OUT THERE IN THE

AUDIENCE TODAY THAT IS TRYING TO DEAL WITH THIS ISSUE. AND

I WANT THE DEFINITION TO BE VERY CLEAR, AS WE HAVE THIS DISCUSSION THAT YOU'RE RASING TODAY, MR. JONES, BECAUSE THAT REALLY DOES GET TO THE HEART OF YOUR POINT, WHICH IS CAN WE USE THIS EMERGENCY REGULATORY PROCESS AS A WAY IN WHICH WE CAN DEAL WITH THE APPROPRIATE INCLUSION OF WHAT CONSTITUTES THE DEFINITION OF A WASTE TIRE. AND I SEE THAT IT'S SOMEWHAT ALTERED FROM WHAT YOU JUST READ.

MEMBER JONES: SO THE FACT THAT USED TIRES ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE DEFINITION OF A WASTE TIRE -- IT SAYS "WASTE TIRES INCLUDE REPAIRABLE TIRES, SCRAP TIRES AND ALTERED WASTE TIRES," THEN WASTE TIRES IS NOT A WASTE TIRE BY THIS DEFINITION. "WASTE TIRES DO NOT INCLUDE TIRE-DERIVED PRODUCTS OR CRUMB RUBBER OR PROPERLY STORED AS DEFINED USED TIRES."

SO THAT WOULD -- OKAY, I DIDN'T SEE THIS

DEFINITION. AND SO THIS IS ESSENTIALLY EXACTLY -- PRETTY

CLOSE TO THE SAME, SO.

18 THIS IS SOME HANDOUT THAT THEY

19 JUST --

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- MASTER OF THE ADJECTIVES, EXACTLY, PRETTY CLOSE.

MEMBER JONES: EXACTLY, PRETTY CLOSE. WELL, IT'S

MY GARBAGE MAN MENTALITY, YOU KNOW, I JUST SAY IT IN

ENGLISH.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M GOING TO GIVE YOU MORE EITHER/ORS.

MR. CHANDLER: AGAIN, I THINK YOUR QUESTION IS, IS

DO WE USE THIS REGULATORY PROCESS AROUND THE EMERGENCY REGS

IN MAKING A MODIFICATION TO -- ENSURING WE DON'T LOSE OUR

REVOCATION OF THE EXCLUSIONS OR EXEMPTIONS TO BE ADDED TO,

IF YOU WILL, TODAY IN DISCUSSING WHAT'S THE APPROPRIATE

DEFINITION OF A WASTE TIRE. AND I JUST WAS CONCERNED THAT

YOU READ INTO THE TRANSCRIPT A DEFINITION THAT I BELIEVE IN

A FUTURE AGENDA ITEM, WHEN WE DISCUSS THE WASTE TIRE REPORT

IT IS GOING TO BE ASKED THAT YOU CONSIDER AS A BOARD TO

MODIFY THAT DEFINITION TO INCLUDE THIS LANGUAGE. SO LET'S

JUST MAKE SURE WE'RE ALL CLEAR ON WHAT LANGUAGE WE MIGHT

WANT TO INCLUDE INTO THESE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS.

2.2

MS. NAUMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS --

CHAIRMAN EATON: SENATOR ROBERTI I BELIEVE HAD A COMMENT, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN.

MEMBER ROBERTI: WELL, YEAH, I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE
ADDED THREE POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION FOR REGULATIONS WHEN
STAFF RETURNS TO US AS TO WHETHER THE BOARD WANTS TO ADOPT
THEM OR NOT.

NUMBER ONE, YESTERDAY WHEN I WAS IN GRIDLEY,
ONE OF THE CONCERNS THAT SEEMED TO BE REPRESENTED TO ME BY
THE PEOPLE CONCERNED WAS THAT IT'S -- ONE OF THE EXPENSES,

OVER-ARCHING EXPENSES FOR LEVEE CONSTRUCTION IS THERE'S NO PLACE TO KEEP ON SITE CRUMB RUBBER AND, THEREFORE, EVERY DAY EVERY HAUL HAS TO BE RE-HAULED IN WITHOUT STORAGE NO SITE, WHICH BECOMES A VERY GREAT BOTH HAULING AND TRANSPORTATION EXPENSE.

SO, IF WE CAN HAVE SOME KIND OF REGULATION
WHICH MAKES A PERMIT FOR THE STORAGE OF CRUMB RUBBER ON SITE
FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, AT LEAST SOMETHING FOR US TO
DISCUSS, I THINK WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT. THAT'S NUMBER
ONE.

NUMBER TWO, ON TWO OTHER ITEMS, I AM TOLD BY
MY STAFF THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT SOME COMPANIES HAVE TRUST
FUNDS, THOSE TRUST FUNDS DO NOT -- ARE NOT - IT IS NOT
CLEARLY INDICATED THAT THE TRUST FUND HAS TO COVER THE
EXPENSES OF ALL THE TIRES ON SITE, AND THAT NEEDS SOME
CLARIFICATION THAT THAT BE THE CASE.

AND NUMBER THREE, TO THE EXTENT THAT SOME

COMPANIES HAVE INSURANCE, THERE APPEARS TO BE A PROBLEM THAT

WE AREN'T ABLE TO OBTAIN THE INSURANCE AHEAD OF TIME, BUT WE

HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THE PROJECT IS FINISHED AND, THEREFORE,

WE END UP EXPENDING OUR MONEY RATHER THAN THE INSURANCE

COMPANY SPENDING ITS, AND THAT'S SOMETHING ELSE THAT I THINK

OUGHT TO BE CLARIFIED IN REGULATIONS.

CHAIRMAN EATON: INSURANCE IN THE SENSE OF THE

PURCHASE OF A POLICY --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER ROBERTI: THE CLEANUP.

CHAIRMAN EATON: CLEANUP.

MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH, PURCHASE OF THE POLICY BY

THE PERSON WHO'S HOLDING THE TIRES.

CHAIRMAN EATON: GOTCHA.

MS. NAUMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, WITH RESPECT TO THE ITEMS THAT THE SENATOR HAS RAISED.

THE FIRST ONE THAT HAS TO DEAL WITH THE

STORAGE OF THE CRUMB RUBBER WHILE THE PROJECT IS BEING DONE,

I BELIEVE THAT IT'S THE INTENT OF THE DEFINITION THAT MR.

CHANDLER READ YOU, THAT IS CONTAINED IN THE LATEST DRAFT OF

THE TIRE REPORT THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BE TAKING UP IN A

LITTLE WHILE ON WASTE TIRE, SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDES CRUMB

RUBBER. SO I THINK THE INTENT WAS TO EXCLUDE ANY WHAT WE'RE

CALLING PRODUCT FROM THE NEED FOR A PERMIT. SO THAT IF YOU

ARE UTILIZING THAT PRODUCT IN AN ENGINEERING PROJECT, SUCH

AS THE LEVEE PROJECT IN GRIDLEY, YOU WOULD NOT NEED TO HAVE

A STORAGE PERMIT UNDER THE PROPOSED DEFINITION OF WASTE

TIRE.

WITH RESPECT TO THE --

CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT WOULD REQUIRE A STATUTORY

CHANGE, THOUGH, WOULDN'T IT, AS A RESULT OF THE TIRE REPORT

BEING APPROVED?

MS. NAUMAN: WELL, I THINK YOU'RE ATTEMPTING TO AFFECT IT THROUGH A REGULATORY CHANGE IN THE DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRE, IS MY UNDERSTANDING. MAYBE FITZ CAN HELP US, BUT I THINK THAT WAS THE INTENT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE, BECAUSE

I THINK YOUR COMMENT WAS IF THE REGULATIONS COME BACK YOU

WANTED TO BE ASSURED. BUT IS THERE A GAP IN BETWEEN THAT

TIME --

MEMBER ROBERTI: ABSOLUTELY, YEAH.

2.2

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND I JUST WANT SOME

CLARIFICATION THERE SO THAT -- THE TIRE REPORT MAY TAKE IT,

BUT BECAUSE THE TIRE REPORT BEING APPROVED BY US AND BEING

SENT TO THE APPROPRIATE BODIES, EVEN IF THEY AGREE WITH THE

REPORT IT'S NOT LAW IN AND OF ITSELF, IT IS SIMPLY A REPORT.

SO I JUST WANT TO KIND OF MAKE SURE, IN CASE THESE

REGULATIONS COME BACK, THAT THE THREE ITEMS WERE THERE ARE

APPROPRIATE. SO, I MEAN --

MS. NAUMAN: YEAH, RIGHT. IF WE WERE TO PURSUE MR. JONES' INTEREST IN PERHAPS DOING SOMETHING WITH THIS PACKAGE, USING THIS AS THE VEHICLE TO CHANGE THE DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRE, IT COULD ALSO ACCOMMODATE THE SENATOR'S CONCERN.

WITH RESPECT TO THE TRUST FUND, JUST KIND OF FOR CLARIFICATION, THE WAY IT WORKS IS THAT THE -- THE TRUST

FUND IS FUNDED OVER, I BELIEVE, A FIVE-YEAR PERIOD, 20% OF THE AMOUNT OF THE TRUST FUND IS REQUIRED TO BE DEPOSITED ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. SO, IT DOES NOT NECESSARILY TRACK WITH THE NUMBER OF TIRES THAT ARE BEING ACCUMULATED OVER THAT PERIOD OF TIME. YOU COULD ACCUMULATE 100% OF THE NUMBER OF TIRES THAT ARE PERMITTED UNDER YOUR PERMIT, AND YET ONLY HAVE 20% OR 40%, ETC., OF THE AMOUNT OF INSURANCE THAT NEEDS TO BE IN THE TRUST FUND. SO THAT'S THE SENSE OF WHAT HIS CONCERN IS. AND THE -- I THINK THE INSURANCE THING IS SOMEWHAT SELF-EXPLANATORY. CHAIRMAN EATON: WE HAVE IN THE PAST, THOUGH, HAVEN'T WE, WITH REGARD TO THE TRUST FUND, REQUIRED AN APPLICANT -- IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, A COUPLE OF MONTHS AGO --MS. NAUMAN: YES. CHAIRMAN EATON: -- THAT HE OR SHE MUST PUT UP EITHER THE FULL AMOUNT OR IF IT WAS, YOU KNOW, 20,000 FOR --MS. NAUMAN: YES. CHAIRMAN EATON: -- 20,000 TIRES OR SOMETHING? SO I DON'T KNOW --MS. NAUMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN --CHAIRMAN EATON: -- IF THERE'S FLEXIBILITY THAT CAN BE --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- BUILT IN THERE, OR SOMETHING

MS. NAUMAN: YEAH.

TO ACCOMPLISH THE SAME GOAL.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. NAUMAN: YOU DID IN ONE INSTANCE THAT I'M
FAMILIAR WITH DO PRECISELY THAT, WITH A CRUMB RUBBER
OPERATION. AND I REMEMBER MR. JONES CRAFTING THAT SO YOU
HAD A KIND OF A SLIDING SCALE, AS THE NUMBER OF TIRES
ACCUMULATED INCREASED THEN THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE TRUST
FUND INCREASED ACCORDINGLY. AND WE CRAFTED THAT FOR THAT
PARTICULAR PERMIT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: LET ME ASK A QUESTION WITH REGARD

TO THE PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE DEFINITION. IS THERE

CURRENTLY A DEFINITION OF STATUTE, MR. BLOCK?

MR. BLOCK: OF WASTE TIRES?

CHAIRMAN EATON: UM-HUM.

MR. BLOCK: YES.

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND SO THIS REGULATION, OR CHANGE IN DEFINITION WOULD SUPERSEDE THE STATUTE?

MR. BLOCK: NO.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OR, I MEAN -- SO I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR HERE THAT IF WE -- YOU KNOW, BUT I DON'T WANT THE PUBLIC OR ANY OF US TO BE --

MR. BLOCK: RIGHT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- IN A SITUATION WHEREIN WE PASS

A REGULATION, WE THINK IT'S THE LAW, AND THERE'S A STATUTE

THAT SUPERSEDES IT OR PREEMPTS IT. SO WHAT IS THE CONTEXT

BY WHICH THIS WOULD ARISE, AND THE PARAMETERS BY WHICH WE AS A BOARD CAN ACT WITHIN THAT?

MR. BLOCK: BASICALLY THE STATUTE PREVAILS OVER REGULATIONS. THE BOARD OR ANY OTHER STATE AGENCY THAT'S AUTHORIZED TO DO REGULATIONS CANNOT ADOPT REGULATIONS THAT CONFLICT WITH STATUTE. HOWEVER, THEY ARE AUTHORIZED TO IMPLEMENT THOSE STATUTES WHICH WOULD INCLUDE MAKING THE STATUTES MORE SPECIFIC, FOR INSTANCE, AS LONG AS THEY DON'T CONFLICT WITH THE OVERALL DEFINITION.

SO THE QUESTION, FOR INSTANCE, THAT WAS RAISED BEFORE IN TERMS OF DEFINING CRUMB RUBBER AS NOT BEING WASTE TIRE, AS LONG AS THAT DOESN'T CONFLICT WITH THE STATUTORY DEFINITIONS THE BOARD COULD MAKE THE REGULATORY DEFINITION MORE SPECIFIC IF, IN FACT, THAT WAS CONSISTENT.

AND THE INFORMATION THAT I HAVE IS THAT THAT TYPE OF DEFINITION WOULD NOT CONFLICT WITH THE STATUTE OUTRIGHT.

2.2

ONE OTHER POINT I DO NEED TO MAKE I THINK, IN TERMS OF SOME OF THE TERMS THAT HAVE BEEN MENTIONED HERE, IN TERMS OF PERHAPS ADDING THE DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRE, THE ONE THAT WAS READ TO THE REGULATIONS, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF TERMS THAT ARE REFERENCED IN THE PROPOSED DEFINITION THAT WOULD PROBABLY THEN ALSO NEED TO BE DEFINED IN THESE REGULATIONS.

FOR INSTANCE, THERE IS NO DEFINITION OF CRUMB

RUBBER IN THE REGULATIONS, SO IT WOULD HAVE TO NOT JUST BE REFERENCED IN THE DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRE BUT YOU NEED TO ACTUALLY DEFINE CRUMB RUBBER, OTHERWISE WE'D BE BACK TO HAVING AN ARGUMENT AS TO, YOU KNOW, WHAT WE MEAN BY CRUMB RUBBER.

BUT, AGAIN, AS LONG AS THOSE DON'T CONFLICT WITH STATUTE YOU COULD DO THAT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DO HAVE A

LITTLE PROBLEM WITH THE DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRES, AND THAT

IS THE ALTERED WASTE TIRE.

(THE MEMBERS CONFER SIDE BAR.)

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT, THAT THOSE ARE ALL WASTE 14 TIRES.

(THE MEMBERS CONFER SIDE BAR.)

CHAIRMAN EATON: LET'S PERHAPS HEAR FROM THE PUBLIC WHILE WE'RE WAITING, WHILE YOU TWO GENTLEMEN ARE LOOKING THROUGH ITEMS.

19 FIRST AND FOREMOST, I HAVE BOB WINTERS FROM 20 ATLAS RUBBER.

MR. WINTERS: GOOD MORNING --

CHAIRMAN EATON: GOOD MORNING.

MR. WINTERS: -- MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE

24 BOARD.

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

21

2.2

23

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

WE ARE FACED WITH, IN THE CRUMB RUBBER
INDUSTRY -- AND I SAY CRUMB RUBBER BECAUSE EVERYBODY HAS
COME TO CALL GROUND, GRANULATED, CRACKED RUBBER AS CRUMB
RUBBER. CRUMB RUBBER PAINTS A PICTURE OF A -- TO ME OF A
COFFEE CAN AND YOU POUR OUT THE MATERIAL AND IT FLOWS, IT'S
A QUARTER INCH, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, OR FINER.

NOW, CONTRARY TO WHAT MR. BLOCK INDICATED

EARLIER, THERE IS A DEFINITION, I'M TOLD, OF CRUMB RUBBER IN

THE REGULATIONS. AND THAT'S QUARTER-INCH OR FINER. IS THAT

NOT TRUE?

MS. SMALL: (PRESUMED). WITHIN THE REGULATIONS
THERE IS A PORTION THAT SAYS THAT WE DO NOT REGULATE WASTE
TIRES THAT HAVE BEEN CRUMBED TO A QUARTER INCH OR LESS.

MR. WINTERS: RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. NAUMAN: I BELIEVE THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE REFERRING TO.

MR. WINTERS: RIGHT, RIGHT, THAT'S WHAT I'M
18 REFERRING TO.

MS. NAUMAN: BUT IT DOESN'T SPECIFICALLY DEFINE CRUMB RUBBER AS THAT PARTICULAR DIMENSION.

MR. WINTERS: WELL, OKAY. BUT IN EFFECT I THINK

IT'S THE SAME THING. BECAUSE THE DEFINITION BY INFERENCE IS

THAT ANYTHING A QUARTER INCH OR SMALLER IS CRUMB RUBBER.

I THINK THE TERM "CRUMB RUBBER," ONCE AGAIN,

IS A MISLEADING TERM BECAUSE -- AND I'VE WRITTEN TO STAFF
ABOUT THIS AND BEEN TOLD THAT THIS CAN'T BE ACTED UPON NOW,
MAYBE IN A YEAR OR TWO WE CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

WE'RE FACED WITH A PROBLEM IMMEDIATELY ON
THIS ISSUE, WHERE THE TERM CRUMB RUBBER DOES NOT APPLY TO
OUR ONE-INCH CUBES THAT WE SELL AS A FINISHED PRODUCT IN A
PACKAGE. IT DOES NOT APPLY TO THE TWO- TO THREE-INCH-LONG
SHREDS WHICH WE PACKAGE AND SELL AS A FINISHED PRODUCT.
THOSE ARE NOW BEING REGULATED BY L.A. COUNTY FIRE PREVENTION
AS WHOLE TIRE OR SHREDDED WHOLE TIRE BECAUSE THEY DO NOT
MEET THE QUARTER-INCH OR SMALLER DEFINITION OF CRUMB RUBBER,
IF YOU WILL.

2.2

AS A RESULT, WE'RE IN THE PROCESS OF LOOKING FOR AND SHOPPING FOR ADDITIONAL STORAGE SPACE, AND ALL OF THE CITIES AND COUNTY AGENCIES IN OUR AREA ARE GOING BY (A) THE FIRE REGULATIONS THEMSELVES, WHICH EACH AND EVERY CITY AND COUNTY HAVE.

AND WHEN WE MENTION THAT, BUT THIS IS CRUMB RUBBER, IT IS NOT WHOLE TIRES, IT'S NOT SHREDDED WHOLE TIRES, WE DO NOT HAVE TO LEAVE 40-FOOT AISLES, AND SO FORTH AND SO ON. THAT IT IS, BY DEFINITION IN THE FIRE CODES, A DIFFERENT MATERIAL THAT, HEAVEN FORBID, BURNS DIFFERENTLY, IS NOT THE SAME HAZARD AS WHOLE TIRES OR SHREDDED WHOLE TIRES. BUT, NEVERTHELESS, WE'RE BEING FORCED TO COMPLY WITH

THESE FIRE DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS THAT WILL NOT ALLOW US TO STORE ANYTHING LARGER THAN QUARTER-INCH AS CRUMB RUBBER, OR AS GRANULATED RUBBER, OR AS FINISHED PRODUCT, OR, CALL IT WHAT YOU WILL. THEY ARE CONSIDERING THOSE TO BE TIRES OR SHREDDED TIRES, WHICH CARRY A MUCH HEAVIER BURDEN AS FAR AS REGULATION, AS YOU ALL KNOW.

SO, I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST A STUDY RELATIVE
TO WHAT CAN BE DONE TO REDEFINE GRANULATED OR CRUMB RUBBER
AND THE FINISHED PRODUCTS THAT THOSE OF US IN THE INDUSTRY
WORK WITH EVERY DAY.

AND, ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS OF

MR. WINTERS?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. WINTERS: I JUST WISH I COULD IMPART ON YOU
THE URGENCY OF THIS MATTER WHEN IT COMES TO OUR COMPANY, AND
ONE OTHER THAT WE'RE FAMILIAR WITH, BECAUSE WE'RE AGAINST A
STONE WALL ON THE COST OF STORAGE OF THIS VERY LOW-VALUE
COMMODITY THAT HAS TO BE DONE IN MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF
POUNDS TO BE -- TO AMOUNT TO ANYTHING. AND TO IMPOSE THE
SCRAP TIRE REGS ON THEM IS REALLY A SERIOUS FINANCIAL
BURDEN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU.

PAUL VALLONE.

MR. VALLONE: GOOD MORNING CHAIRMAN EATON AND THE

REST OF THE BOARD. MY NAME IS PAUL VALLONE, I'M THE MANAGER FOR THE STOCKTON COGEN AIR PRODUCTS FACILITY OUT IN STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA.

AND I JUST WANTED TO SAY THAT I'M IN SUPPORT OF THE REGULATIONS, AND ALSO APPRECIATE YOUR ASSISTANCE IN MAINTAINING THE EXCLUSION THAT WILL BE ABLE TO KEEP, AS FAR AS MOVEABLE TRAILERS, UNTIL WE'VE PROGRESSED FURTHER ON WITH THE TIRE POLICY.

AND AS BOARD MEMBER JONES MENTIONED, I WILL BE LEAVING THIS AREA, AND I APPRECIATE THE SUPPORT AND THE WORK THAT WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO DO IN THE PAST TWO YEARS ON TIRES, AND THE PAST FOUR YEARS WITH OUR ASH BYPRODUCTS AS WELL.

I REPRESENT NOT ONLY MYSELF, BUT MY WHOLE COMPANY, AND YOU CAN BE ASSURED THAT, YOU KNOW, WE'LL CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE AND OTHER ACTIVITIES WITH THE BOARD AS THEY COME UP. THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU, MR. VALLONE, AND GOOD 19 LUCK.

JANA NARIN.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. NARIN: THANK YOU MR. CHAIRMAN, AND GOOD MORNING TO THE BOARD MEMBERS.

I APPRECIATED THE COMMENTS BY ALL THE BOARD

MEMBERS REGARDING THESE ISSUES, AND I AGREE WITH QUITE A FEW

-- BIT OF WHAT'S BEEN SAID.

2.2

2.3

I'D LIKE TO EXPRESS OUR SUPPORT OF THE EXCLUSION FOR MOVABLE, LOCKABLE CONTAINERS FOR THOSE APPROVED END USERS SUCH AS AIR PRODUCTS BECAUSE IT'S VERY BENEFICIAL FOR THEM TO HAVE THAT EXCLUSION.

HOWEVER, I HAVE SOME CONCERNS ABOUT THAT EXCLUSION BEING ABUSED BY THE LESS LEGITIMATE HAULERS AND FACILITIES IN THE STATE. AND I KNOW ALL OF OUR CONCERN IS TO ELIMINATE EXCLUSIONS THAT ALLOW LOOPHOLES FOR COMPANIES TO CREATE PROBLEMS FOR ALL OF US TO DEAL WITH.

SO, WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO ENCOURAGE THAT THE BOARD MEMBERS CONSIDER REINSTATING AND/OR UTILIZING SOME OF WHAT IS IN THE RECYCLING BUSINESS EXCLUSION TO POSSIBLY SEE WHAT YOU CAN USE IN THAT. AND THE KEY THERE IS THE INVENTORY TURNOVER. AND I THINK THAT WILL TOUCH ON MR. ROBERTI'S ISSUE REGARDING THE PROJECTS LIKE THE LEVEE PROJECT. IF THAT LEVEE PROJECT WAS CONSIDERED UNDER AN INVENTORY TURNOVER THEY WOULD QUALIFY IMMEDIATELY, BECAUSE THE PRODUCT WILL BE GONE IN TWO WEEKS, IT WOULD BE UTILIZED INTO THAT PROJECT WITHIN TWO WEEKS.

AND SO THAT -- IN ADDITION, THAT WOULD SUPPORT FACILITIES IN THE INDUSTRY THAT HAVE RAPID GROWTH,
BUT ARE ALSO RAPIDLY TURNING OVER THEIR INVENTORY AND
UTILIZING THAT. I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S POSSIBLE, BUT ALONG

THE LINES THAT

MR. JONES HAD TOUCHED ON, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IF THE BOARD MEMBERS COULD UTILIZE SOME OF WHAT'S IN HERE AND WORK WITH IT AND TRY TO GET IT INTO SOME REGULATIONS. AGAIN, TIME BEING OF THE ESSENCE.

AND I REALIZE THAT A LOT OF THIS MAY BE

COVERED WITH THE TIERED PERMITTING THAT MAYBE IN -- STATED

IN THE -- WITH THE LEGISLATION, WITH THE 117 REPORT.

HOWEVER, WE REALIZE IN THE INDUSTRY THAT THAT'S PROBABLY A

COUPLE OF YEARS DOWN THE LINE STILL. SO, I'M HOPING THAT

THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER THIS OPTION IF POSSIBLE. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU.

I HAVE ONE SLIP, MR. GEORGE LARSON REPRESENTING LAKIN TIRE.

MR. LARSON: OKAY. THANK YOU

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS. GEORGE LARSON REPRESENTING LAKIN

TIRE.

YES, I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS, ON BEHALF
OF LAKIN TIRE, SUPPORT FOR RETENTION OF THE LOCKABLE,
MOVEABLE CONTAINER PROVISIONS IN THE REGULATIONS.

HOWEVER, RECOGNIZING, AS MS. NARIN REFLECTED

IN HER COMMENTS, THAT THERE ARE SOME PROBLEMS OUT THERE THAT

ARE ALREADY BEGINNING TO MANIFEST THEMSELVES FOR PEOPLE

MISUSING THIS PROVISION, AND I'D LIKE TO MAKE OUR COMMITMENT

TO WORK WITH YOU TO COME UP WITH A REASONABLE SOLUTION BUT, IN THE MEANTIME KEEP THIS IN PLACE.

HOWEVER, I WOULD LIKE CLARIFICATION FROM THE BOARD ON THE -- CALL IT THE AVAILABILITY OF THIS EXCLUSION TODAY. IN OTHER WORDS, LAKIN TIRE OPERATIONS A NUMBER OF OPERATIONS BESIDES THEIR FULLY-PERMITTED FACILITIES, WHERE COMMON CARRIERS MAY STORE OR PARK A LOCKED CONTAINER, IN THIS CASE PROBABLY A DRY VAN, A 40-FOOT, 48-FOOT TRAILER, BECAUSE THEY CAN'T GET IT QUEUED INTO THE FACILITY WITHIN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME, WHICH MIGHT BE THREE OR 12 HOURS.

2.2

BUT IN THE MEANTIME, WE'RE NOT SURE IF WE
NEED AN EXCLUSION FOR A PARKING LOT WHERE THESE THINGS ARE
BEING PARKED. I KNOW THAT MAY SOUND A LITTLE OF A STRETCH,
BUT IT IS SOMETHING THAT HAS ARISEN. AND WE'VE WRITTEN
CORRESPONDENCE TO THE BOARD TO GET CLARIFICATION.

SO, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF THE LOCKABLE,
MOVEABLE EXCLUSION IS, AGAIN, FOR LACK OF THE EXACT WORDS,
AVAILABLE FOR THOSE WHO FEEL LIKE THEY WANT TO AVAIL
THEMSELVES OF THAT TODAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: STAFF?

MR. VLACH: MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT EXCLUSION IS STILL IN THE REGULATION, IT'S STILL VALID, AND WE HAVE PROCESSED SOME IN THIS PAST YEAR.

MR. LARSON: OKAY, THANK YOU. CHAIRMAN EATON: DOES THAT CLARIFY...? MR. LARSON: YES. YES. CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU, MR. LARSON. ALL RIGHT. MS. NAUMAN? OKAY. GENTLEMEN? MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES. GOOD MORNING. CHAIRMAN EATON: GOOD MORNING. OKAY. MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY, YOU WANTED TO KNOW WHAT 10 TO DO. 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: NO, I'M FINE WITH 12 JUST -- YOU KNOW, THERE JUST SEEMS TO BE A LOT OF CONFUSION AND NEED FOR CLARIFICATION WITH REGARD TO SOME OF THESE 13 14 ISSUES. SO I THINK IF WE CAN KIND OF JUST PERHAPS HAVE A 15 DIALOGUE AS TO -- I KNOW YOU HAD A CONCERN AND SPOKE WITH MR. JONES JUST BRIEFLY, IN TERMS OF CLARIFICATION. SO NOW 16 17 THAT WE HAVE THE RULES OF THE GAME SET BY 18 MR. BLOCK AS TO WHAT WE CAN OR CANNOT DO IN CONTRAVENTION OF 19 THE STATUTE.... 20 MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, IT WOULD SEEM TO ME, MR. 21 CHAIRMAN, THAT MAYBE WHAT WE -- YOU KNOW, WE'RE SORT OF 2.2 FORCED INTO A BOX HERE A LITTLE BIT BECAUSE OF TIMING. 23 AND MAYBE WHAT WE DO IS APPROVE THESE TO BE

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW, AND ALSO SET

24

A TIME CERTAIN IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE, LIKE IN JULY, TO START WORKING ON REVISING THE REGULATIONS SO THAT WE HAVE SOMEPLACE TO MOVE.

I MEAN, WE CANNOT -- I DON'T THINK WE CAN BE
IN A POSITION WHERE WE LOSE THESE EXEMPTIONS AND GET IN THAT
KIND OF A SITUATION AGAIN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I AGREE. AND I THINK YOU ADEQUATELY FRAMED THE ISSUE, IN TERMS OF THE BOX.

WHAT WE WOULD DO, THEN, UNDER YOURS IS BRING
THEM BACK IN JULY FOR PROCESSING AND APPROVAL, AND THE
SUBMIT THOSE AS THE FINAL REGULATIONS? HOPEFULLY?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: RIGHT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. BLOCK?

MR. BLOCK: LET ME, JUST FOR CLARIFICATION,

BECAUSE THERE'S SOMETHING TWO DIFFERENT --

CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

15

16

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. BLOCK: -- THINGS THAT ARE GOING ON THAT HAVE

18 BEEN MIXED UP.

THERE ARE EMERGENCY REGS THAT ARE DUE TO EXPIRE JULY 1ST UNLESS WE RESUBMIT THOSE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: CORRECT.

MR. BLOCK: AND THEN ALSO, I THINK THE OTHER

PURPOSE OF THIS ITEM WAS TO ACTUALLY BRING FORWARD TEXT OF

WHAT THOSE REGULATIONS WERE TO NOTICE THEM FOR A 45-DAY

COMMENT PERIOD, TO START THE ADOPTION OF THE PERMANENT REGS. SO, I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT WHAT WOULD COME BACK IN JULY IF YOU -- IF THAT WAS THE BOARD'S DECISION, WOULD BE TO LOOK AT THE LANGUAGE OF THE REGULATIONS THAT YOU WOULD WANT TO NOTICE FOR A 45-DAY.... MEMBER PENNINGTON: WHAT I WANT TO DO, WHAT I'M SUGGESTING, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS THAT WE MOVE THE EMERGENCY REGS 8 FORWARD NOW --CHAIRMAN EATON: AS IS. 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AS IS. 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. 12 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AND THEN EITHER SET JULY OR, 13 AT THE VERY LATEST, AUGUST AS A TIME TO TRY TO MOVE THE 14 REGULAR -- YOU KNOW, THE PERMANENT REGS FORWARD AND GET THEM 15 IN THE TRACK SO THAT WE -- YOU KNOW, WE'RE NOT CAUGHT IN THIS TIME WARP AGAIN. 16 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: I THINK YOU --18 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AND I THINK IT'S OBVIOUS THERE IS SOME ADJUSTMENT THAT HAS TO BE DONE YET TO ACCOMMODATE 19 20 WHAT SOME OF US FEEL. SO, IT WOULD GIVE US THAT TIME, 21 EITHER THE NEXT MONTH OR SIX WEEKS, TO DO THAT IN. 2.2 CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES? 23 MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK I COULD

24

PROBABLY GO ALONG WITH THAT.

I HAVE A PROBLEM, THOUGH, WITH, YOU KNOW,
THESE EXCLUSIONS. IT WAS NECESSARY FOR US TO REMOVE THESE
EXCLUSIONS. I MEAN, IT WAS BEING ABUSED, IT WAS AN ABSOLUTE
DISASTER, COSTING US A LOT OF MONEY IN CLEANUPS, THAT'S WHY
WE GOT RID OF THESE EXCLUSIONS THROUGH A REG PACKAGE.

ONE OF THE INTERESTING THINGS ABOUT THE STATUTE, WHEN YOU TALK ABOUT THE DEFINITION OF WASTE TIRE, PART OF THE CONTENTION AND CONTENTIOUSNESS BETWEEN THIS BOARD AND USED TIRE DEALERS HAS BEEN THAT THAT DEFINITION IN STATUTE WAS NOT -- HAS NOT -- OUR REGULATIONS HAVE DONE ITS JOB TO ADD DEFINITION TO WHAT STATUTE HAD. THIS DEFINITION IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THAT -- I MEAN, IT DOESN'T GO AGAINST THE STATUTE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT.

2.1

2.2

MEMBER JONES: BECAUSE USED TIRES WERE NOT

IDENTIFIED AS A WASTE TIRE. WHAT IT HAS CREATED WAS A LOT

OF PEOPLE GOING OUT OF BUSINESS, A LOT OF -- WE'RE GOING TO

HAVE 17 FACILITIES THAT ARE GOING TO BE ON A COMPLIANCE

SCHEDULE THAT ARE USED TIRE DEALERS, THEY'RE PRETTY SQUARE
SHOOTERS, SUPPOSEDLY, THAT ARE GOING TO BE IN VIOLATION OF

OUR LAWS BECAUSE OF THIS EMERGENCY PACKAGE.

AND YET WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO GO BACK AND

FIX IT. BUT I'M WONDERING HOW MANY OF THEM HAVE TO COME UP

WITH THE MONEY OR GO OUT OF BUSINESS BETWEEN NOW AND THEN.

THAT CREATES A PROBLEM FOR ME, BECAUSE IT IS -- WE HAVE TWO DEFINITIONS IN OUR REGULATIONS OF WHAT A WASTE TIRE IS. ONE INCLUDES USED TIRES AND ONE DOESN'T.

CHAIRMAN EATON: SO THE ISSUE -- AND I'M JUST

TRYING TO FRAME THE ISSUE, SEPARATE IT -- SO YOUR CONCERN IS

ONE THAT, BECAUSE OF THE TIMING, THAT WE MAY HAVE AN

ENFORCEMENT ISSUE THAT PROVIDES AN UNJUST RESULT WHILE SOME

OF THESE ITEMS ARE BEING WORKED THROUGH AT THE NEXT MEETING,

OR WHATEVER MEETING THAT WE SET ULTIMATELY AS A RESULT OF

OUR ACTION TODAY.

I JUST WANTED --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER JONES: YES. AND MY --

CHAIRMAN EATON: WITH THAT -- OKAY? -- WITH THAT,

I JUST WANT TO FIND OUT THEN, ARE THERE ANY OPTIONS THAT CAN

ALLEVIATE OR SATISFY YOUR CONCERNS, WHICH THEN PUTS YOU IN

CONFORMANCE WHERE MR. PENNINGTON IS. AND IF THAT'S THE

ISSUE, IF THE ISSUE IS ONE OF ENFORCEMENT AND/OR THE BOARD'S

ACTIONS BEING ABLE TO NOT TAKE AN ACTION AGAINST THEM -- I

DON'T KNOW IF THAT HELPS YOU OR ALLEVIATES YOUR CONCERN.

BUT I'D LIKE TO FIND OUT, I GUESS, FROM LEGAL STAFF OR OTHER

STAFF....

AND THEN I HAVE ONE OTHER QUESTION AFTER THAT ANSWER, IS THAT OF MY OWN, UNRELATED TO IT.

SO, MR. BLOCK, I GUESS THE FRAMED ISSUE IS

THAT MR. JONES HAS A CONCERN THAT IF WE FOLLOW AND SUBMIT
THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS, AND THEN COME BACK AT A LATER
DATE, TO BE DETERMINED -- IF THAT SHOULD BE THIS BOARD'S
ACTION -- THEN HOW, IF -- DOES MR. JONES' CONCERN WITH
REGARD TO ENFORCEMENT AGAINST INDIVIDUALS WHO APPEAR TO BE
JUST CAUGHT BETWEEN A ROCK AND A HARD PLACE, THROUGH NO
FAULT OF THEIR OWN -- IS THERE SOMETHING THAT WE AS A BOARD
CAN DO OR NOT DO, OR THAT WOULD HELP SOLVE THAT PROBLEM?
UNTIL SUCH TIME AS WE CAN RESOLVE THE FINAL -- AND I DON'T
KNOW IF THERE IS.

MR. BLOCK: RIGHT. AND THERE MIGHT BE SORT OF TWO DIFFERENT ASPECTS TO THE QUESTION YOU ASKED, ONE IS LEGAL, AND ONE, THERE MAY BE SOMETHING THAT EITHER JULIE OR BERNIE WANT TO ADD, IN TERMS OF HOW THIS WOULD PLAY OUT.

2.2

BUT LEGALLY THE BOARD -- AND I THINK THIS IS

A QUESTION ACTUALLY THAT GOT ASKED EARLIER THAT I ENDED UP

NOT BEING ABLE TO ANSWER, BECAUSE WE SORT OF GOT ON TO A FEW

OTHER QUESTIONS. THE BOARD DOES HAVE THE ABILITY IN THE

RESUBMITTAL OF THE EMERGENCY REGS, WITH -- SOMETIME WITHIN

THE NEXT WEEK, BECAUSE WE'VE GOT THIS JULY 1ST DEADLINE

LOOMING -- TO MODIFY THE LANGUAGE OF THESE EMERGENCY REGS

SOMEWHAT. I MEAN, I THINK -- THERE'S NO REAL LIMIT ON

EXACTLY HOW MUCH YOU CAN MODIFY THEM.

BUT, IF IT WERE THE PLEASURE OF THE BOARD TO

ADD SOME OF THOSE DEFINITIONS, OR CHANGE SOME OF THOSE DEFINITIONS, LEGALLY THOSE -- AS LONG AS THEY'RE NOT CONFLICTING WITH STATUTE, WE CAN INCLUDE SOME OF THOSE NOW IN THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS IF THAT'S WHERE YOU WANTED TO GO.

ANOTHER OPTION THAT'S BEEN TALKED ABOUT IS,

OF COURSE, JUST LEAVING THOSE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS AS THEY

ARE, STATUS QUO, SO THAT SOME OF THE ISSUES AS TO WHAT THESE

DEFINITIONS SHOULD BE --

10 CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT APPEARS TO BE

11 MR. PENNINGTON'S ISSUE.

MR. BLOCK: -- WORKED OUT.

13 RIGHT.

14 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M TRYING TO GET TO THE ISSUE,

IS THERE A MIDPOINT --

MR. BLOCK: RIGHT.

17 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- BETWEEN -- AND I'M NOT PUSHING

18 --

12

15

22

23

24

19 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

20 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- BUT I'M JUST TRYING TO FIND

21 OUT WHAT ARE OUR OPTIONS.

MR. BLOCK: IN TERMS OF -- LEGALLY, IN TERMS OF
WHAT THE REGULATION WOULD SAY, ESSENTIALLY I DON'T KNOW THAT
THERE'S A MIDPOINT. THE REGULATIONS WILL EITHER DEFINE SOME

OF THOSE ACTIVITIES AS NOT BEING COVERED BY THE REGULATIONS OR THEY WILL.

AND THERE'S A, YOU KNOW, DECISION THERE, IN
TERMS OF IF THE DEFINITIONS AREN'T WORKED OUT YET -- AND
JULIE AND BERNIE MIGHT WANT TO JUMP IN HERE -- THERE ARE
SOME -- THE BOARD HAS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF PROSECUTORIAL
DISCRETION, IF YOU WILL.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO SAY.

IF -- LET ME GIVE YOU THE HYPOTHETICAL, THAT MR. PENNINGTON

PROPOSES -- AND I DON'T WANT TO PUT WORDS IN YOUR MOUTH -
THAT THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS BE RESUBMITTED AS IS, WITHOUT

ANY CHANGES.

THE QUESTION THEN BECOMES, WHAT PROSECUTORIAL DISCRETION DO WE HAVE, OR DOES THE STAFF HAVE, SO THAT MR.

JONES' CONCERNS, WHICH ARE LEGITIMATE, IE. TAKING

ENFORCEMENT ACTION AND/OR IN VIOLATION AND/OR PUTTING UP

SUBSTANTIAL DOLLARS CAN BE.

YOU'VE ANSWERED THE FIRST HYPOTHETICAL, WHICH IS BASICALLY HOW YOU CAN AMEND THEM AFTER.

MR. BLOCK: RIGHT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M JUST TRYING TO FIND OUT IF THERE'S OPTIONS, IF THE BOARD CAN LOOK AT THEM AND CHOOSE WHICH IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE, GIVEN THE TIME CONSTRAINTS THAT WE'RE ALL PUT IN THE BOX.

MR. CHANDLER: CAN I SPEAK TO THIS?

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE -- THIS BOARD HAS AT LEAST ALREADY SET SOME TYPE OF A PRECEDENT IN THIS AREA, WHERE IN THE MID '90S, WHEN WE STARTED THE TIERED PERMITTING PROCESS, WE RECOGNIZED THAT THERE WAS A WHOLE HOST OF TYPES OF FACILITIES OUT THERE -- HANDLING ASH, HANDLING COMPOST, HANDLING ALTERNATIVES TO JUST STRICTLY MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE.

AND WE PUT OUT ADVISORIES TO LEAS INDICATING
THAT UNTIL THIS BOARD CLARIFIES EXACTLY WHAT TYPE OF A
PERMIT WE WANT TO SEE, AND THE CONDITIONS AROUND THAT
PERMIT, THAT WE ENCOURAGE THE LEAS TO NOT SUBMIT THOSE
APPLICATIONS AS A FULL-BLOWN SOLID WASTE AOOKICATIONS.

2.2

THE BOARD CAN INDICATE THAT IN THIS INTERIM

PERIOD WE ARE ENCOURAGING AND DIRECTING STAFF THAT WE NOT

MOVE AGGRESSIVELY ON REQUIRING PERMIT CONDITIONS TO BE

APPLIED WHILE WE SORT THROUGH THE APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS OR

EXEMPTIONS THAT ARE GOING TO BE ULTIMATELY APPLICABLE.

I SEE NO PROBLEMS WITH HAVING US TAKE THIS SUBSET OF INDIVIDUALS, IF THERE IS DIRECTION FROM THE BOARD THAT YOU WANT THAT VERY SUBSET TO BE THE SUBJECT OF A FURTHER REGULATORY REVIEW IN THE COMING WEEKS. AND WE'VE DONE THAT IN THE PAST.

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: THAT WOULD -- MAKES A LOT OF SENSE TO ME, THAT'S A CONSISTENT POLICY WITH WHAT WE DID.

I THINK THE OTHER THING IT DOES, IS IT ALLOWS

US -- AS SENATOR ROBERTI SAID, AND

MR. PENNINGTON -- TO START THE PROCESS TO FINALIZE THESE

REGS. AND I'M ASSUMING THAT THIS'LL COME FORWARD AS AN ITEM

WHERE WE CAN DISCUSS IT AND HAVE OUR INPUT TO IT BEFORE WE

START THE 45-DAY PERIOD, TO GET SOME INPUT FROM THE BOARD,

OR DO WE HAVE TO WAIT 45 DAYS TO --

MR. BLOCK: NO, NO. IF THAT'S YOUR DIRECTION -IT SOUNDS LIKE THE DIRECTION IS TO BRING THIS ITEM BACK
AGAIN. THE 45-DAY -- THE APPROVAL TO NOTICE FOR 45 DAYS IS
BACK IN JULY --

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. BLOCK: -- SO THAT DISCUSSION ABOUT WHAT THE REGS SHOULD SAY WOULD TAKE PLACE BEFORE THE NOTICE PERIOD STARTS.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY. NOW THAT --

MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WOULD MAKE -- I COULD DEAL WITH THAT.

AND THE OTHER THING I THINK IT DOES -- I'M

NOT SURE IF ALL 17 OF THOSE FACILITIES ARE, YOU KNOW, SQUARE

AND UP-FRONT; I'VE BEEN ASSURED THAT THEY PROBABLY ARE. BUT

THAT GIVES THE STAFF A LITTLE BIT OF LATITUDE IN TIME TO SEE

IF WE'RE NOT LETTING -- WHAT'S THE APPROPRIATE WAY TO DEAL WITH THIS, AND THAT WOULD TAKE CARE OF IT. AND I THINK THOSE USED TIRE DEALERS THAT WE'RE FORCING OUT OF BUSINESS HAVE A LITTLE BIT OF TIME TO DEAL WITH THIS, WHICH IS BETTER THAN WHAT IT'S BEEN FOR THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS.

SO, I'M SATISFIED WITH THAT, AND CAN GO ALONG WITH MR. PENNINGTON'S IDEA, AND WE CAN INCLUDE MR. ROBERTI'S ITEM, SENATOR ROBERTI'S ITEM, AND MINE WHEN WE GET INTO THE DISCUSSION IN JULY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I JUST HAVE ONE QUESTION, AND IT REGARDS THE RESOLUTION THAT WE WOULD BE ASKED TO ADOPT ON AGENDA ITEM 3, ATTACHMENT 2, 1999-278.

WE TALK ABOUT -- IRRESPECTIVE OF WHICH COURSE

WE TAKE, THE RESOLVE CLAUSE SPEAKS IN TERMS OF FINAL

REGULATIONS? IS THAT ACCURATE? OR SHOULD THAT BE

EMERGENCY?

MEMBER JONES: WHERE ABOUT --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: (PRESUMED QUOTATION): "NOW,
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THE BOARD WILL AUTHORIZE THE STAFF
TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT TO THE OAL FINAL REGULATIONS."

MS. NAUMAN: I BELIEVE THAT'S THE CORRECT TERM.

TT'S EITHER FINAL OR --

CHAIRMAN EATON: I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE, SINCE
WE'RE GOING THROUGH EMERGENCY --

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MS. NAUMAN: YEAH.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I MEAN, I JUST --

MS. SMALL: JUST TO MAYBE -- THIS MIGHT CLARIFY.

THIS PACKAGE WAS COMING FORWARD AS THE EMERGENCY REGS TO BE

PUT OUT FOR A 45-DAY NOTICE TO MAKE THEM FINAL. IT DIDN'T
- IT WASN'T ADDRESSING WHETHER OR NOT WE WERE GOING TO PUT

THE EMERGENCY REGS THROUGH, BECAUSE WE HAVE TO DO THAT

EITHER WAY, SINCE THEY EXPIRE BEFORE THE 45 DAYS WOULD PASS.

WE WOULD HAVE TO HAVE DONE THAT IN ANY EVENT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT. SO THIS IS THE NOTICING
REQUIREMENT --

MS. SMALL: SO THAT RESOLUTION IS CORRECT, AS FAR AS HOW THE ITEM WAS ORIGINALLY DRAFTED.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. SO FOR PURPOSES OF TODAY'S ACTION, THE RESOLUTION SPEAKS TO THE NOTICING FOR THE 45-DAY PERIOD. IF WE WERE TO EITHER GO FORWARD WITH MR.

PENNINGTON'S -- WHICH APPEARS TO BE THE CASE, AS WELL AS MR.

JONES'S CONCURRENCE, AND ADDING SENATOR ROBERTI'S THREE

THAT A DIRECTION THAT WE JUST MAKE AS A BOARD? OR, DO WE

ITEMS, AT LEAST HERE -- IS THERE ANOTHER RESOLUTION OR IS

HAVE TO MAKE A MOTION ON IT? BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE A

RESOLUTION WITH REGARD TO THE SUBMITTAL OF THOSE EMERGENCY

24 REGULATIONS.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

MR. BLOCK: RIGHT. AND I THINK WHAT WE HAD,

THERE'S BEEN A LITTLE BIT OF CONFUSION BECAUSE WE'RE DEALING

WITH SORT OF TWO DIFFERENT PACKAGES, IF YOU WILL, THE

EMERGENCY REGS AND THE 45-DAY, IN TERMS OF THE DISCUSSION.

TYPICALLY WHEN THE BOARD GIVES APPROVAL TO GO
FOR A 45-DAY NOTICE PERIOD WE ACTUALLY DON'T DO A RESOLUTION
BECAUSE IT'S JUST THE BEGINNING OF THE PROCESS, AND SO
THAT'S WHY SOME OF THIS LANGUAGE MIGHT LOOK A LITTLE BIT
DIFFERENT THAN ANYTHING YOU'VE SEEN BEFORE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: BUT WE'RE NOW DOING -- MR. BLOCK: RIGHT, I UNDERSTAND.

ALSO, SEPARATE FROM THAT, IN TERMS OF

EMERGENCY REGS, AFTER THE BOARD HAS APPROVED THOSE IN THE

PAST, TYPICALLY TO CONTINUE TO RENEW THOSE WHILE WE'RE

WAITING FOR THE PERMANENT REGS TO BE ADOPTED, THOSE ARE -
TYPICALLY DON'T COME BACK BEFORE THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL EACH

TIME TO EXTEND THE REGULATIONS. SO, TYPICALLY YOU WOULDN'T

HAVE A RESOLUTION FOR EITHER OF THOSE. WE CAN CERTAIN DO

THAT --

CHAIRMAN EATON: NO, I'M NOT ASKING, I'M JUST

TRYING TO FIND OUT WHAT ACTION ITEMS WE HAVE TO REQUEST OF

YOU IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO COMPLETE THE PROCESS.

MR. BLOCK: RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: I UNDERSTAND THE 45-DAY, BUT DO

WE HAVE TO MAKE A MOTION WITH REGARD TO THE RESUBMITTAL?

THAT'S A SIMPLE QUESTION.

MR. BLOCK: THE SHORT ANSWER IS, LEGALLY YOU WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO MAKE A MOTION. HOWEVER, GIVEN THE DISCUSSION THAT'S GONE ON TODAY, FOR THE RECORD IT WOULD PROBABLY MAKE SENSE TO HAVE A MOTION TO INCLUDE THE DIRECTION --

CHAIRMAN EATON: NOW YOU'RE --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MR. BLOCK: -- ON BOTH THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS AND ON THE -- WHAT YOU WANT TO HAPPEN WITH THE PERMANENT REGULATIONS, JUST SO THAT THERE'S CLARITY.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WILL THERE BE ONE OR TWO MOTIONS?

CHAIRMAN EATON: THERE WILL BE TWO MOTIONS, ONE
THAT DEALS WITH THE NOTICING REQUIREMENT AND ONE THAT WOULD
DEAL WITH THE SUBMISSION. IT TOOK US A LONG WAY, BUT THAT'S
WHERE I WAS GOING. I PROBABLY COULD HAVE CUT TO THE CHASE,
BUT.

SO, LET ME SEE IF I CAN KIND OF RECAPTURE -AND I KNOW, SENATOR, YOU WERE HERE FOR PART OF IT. MR.

PENNINGTON HAD ASKED THAT WE JUST SUBMIT THE EMERGENCY

REGULATION AS IS.

AND THEN -- AND I'M NOT SURE WHEN YOU HAD TO

LEAVE -- BUT MR. JONES' ISSUE OF CHANGING SOME OF THE

DEFINITIONS AND KIND OF MASSAGING AND WORKING -- BECAUSE

THERE WERE CERTAIN ISSUES REVOLVING AROUND DEFINITIONS THAT,

THROUGH AN ENFORCEMENT ACTION, IF WE DIDN'T TAKE THAT ACTION

THOSE INDIVIDUALS MAY HAVE A ACTION OF ENFORCEMENT OF SOME

TYPE AGAINST THEM, THROUGH NO FAULT OF THEIR OWN, ESPECIALLY

SINCE WE'RE IN THIS PERIOD OF LIMBO.

REALIZING THAT, THE POSITION OF COUNSEL, AND THEN CONFIRMED BY THE STAFF, WAS THAT -- AND OUR HISTORIAN HERE, MR. CHANDLER, SPOKE IN TERMS OF THE BOARD'S PRIOR ACTIONS BY WHICH WE CAN ADOPT A METHOD BY WHICH WE SEND OUT AN ADVISORY, SAYING EVEN THOUGH THESE DEFINITIONS STATE THAT, YOU KNOW, THEY WOULD MAYBE BE IN VIOLATION, UNTIL WE WORK THROUGH THE REGULATIONS AND GET THE FINAL DEFINITIONS WE WOULD NOT BE TAKING ANY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS, OR WOULD NOT PROCESS ANY PAPER IN THAT REGARD.

AND I THINK THAT'S KIND OF WHERE WE ARE AS IT
RELATES TO THAT. AND MR. JONES SAID THAT WOULD BE
SUFFICIENT WITH HIM, AS LONG AS WE HAD THAT DIRECTION GIVEN
OUT TO THE LEAS, TO THE APPROPRIATE --

MS. NAUMAN: ACTUALLY, IN THIS

INSTANCE --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M SORRY --

MS. NAUMAN: -- IT WOULD BE TO OUR OWN STAFF.

CHAIRMAN EATON: TO OUR OWN STAFF AT THIS POINT.

SO, I DON'T KNOW WHAT PART OF IT YOU MISSED OR WHATEVER, BUT I KIND OF RESTATED IT FOR THE RECORD, JUST TO BE CLEAR. AND THAT, FOR ALL OF YOU, WE WOULD DO TWO MOTIONS, ONE THAT REGARDS THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS AND ONE THAT REGARDS THE NOTICING.

SO, WITH THAT, MR. CHANDLER.

MR. CHANDLER: THE ONLY QUESTION I HAVE IS THAT -I THINK WE'RE CLEAR THAT, DUE TO THE COMPLEXITY AND THE NEED
FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON WHAT CONSTITUTES THE UNALTERED TIRE, A
WASTE TIRE, A USED TIRE -- WE'RE GOING TO START THAT
PROCESS. YOU'VE DIRECTED THAT WE COME BACK IN JULY TO GET
THAT WORK GOING.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

THERE WERE SOME OTHER ISSUES, THOUGH, THAT
WERE RAISED THAT WE COULD INCLUDE IN THE NEXT MONTH'S
EFFORT, OR WE COULD INCLUDE IN THESE EMERGENCY REGS TODAY.
AND I GUESS I'M NOT CLEAR IF YOU WANT TO DEAL WITH THE ISSUE
ON THE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OR ANY OF THE OTHER ASPECTS
THAT WE RAISED, OR ARE YOU COMFORTABLE SEEING THOSE INCLUDED
IN THE DEFINITIONAL ISSUES THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE BRINGING
NEXT MONTH?

MEMBER ROBERTI: IF YOU BRING THESE DEFINITIONAL ISSUES NEXT MONTH, THAT WOULD BE FINE.

MR. CHANDLER: NEXT MONTH. OKAY. THANK YOU FOR

THAT.

10

12

13

14

20

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND I THINK IT'S --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO TRY --

CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE. AND I THINK IT'S A GOOD

IDEA THAT WE BRING THEM BACK IN JULY, BECAUSE IN AUGUST

WE'RE GOING TO BE UP IN QUINCY, IN ONE OF OUR RURAL VISITS,

AND IT MAY BE HARD FOR SOME OF THOSE WHO MAY HAVE COMMENTS

OR -- SO, TO FIND QUINCY, OR THE ROAD MAY BE CROWDED DUE TO

THE SUMMER RUSH AND VACATION.

MR. PENNINGTON, IF YOU WOULD PLEASE.

11 MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL MOVE

THAT WE SUBMIT THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS FOR AN ADDITIONAL

45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD --

MR. BLOCK: THE EMERGENCY REGULATIONS WOULD BE FOR

15 AN EXTENSION.

16 MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. TO SUBMIT THE EMERGENCY

17 REGULATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION, WITHHOLDING ENFORCEMENT UNTIL

18 PERMANENT REGULATIONS ARE APPROVED.

19 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION.

MADAM SECRETARY, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE

21 ROLL?

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

MEMBER JONES: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI? MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE. THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON? CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE. MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. NUMBER TWO MOTION, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT WE WOULD BRING BACK TO THE BOARD PERMANENT REGULATIONS FOR APPROVAL AND SUBMITTAL TO OAL AT THE JULY BOARD MEETING. 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: AND THAT WE DIRECT STAFF TO 11 INCLUDE THE THREE ITEMS THAT MR. ROBERTI HAD MENTIONED, 12 WHICH WAS THE STORAGE OF CRUMB RUBBER ON SITES AND THE 13 CLARIFICATION, OR OTHER KINDS OF EXPLANATION. THE TRUST 14 FUND ISSUE, WHICH WE'VE ALL HEARD ABOUT THE SHORTFALL, A 15 SHORTAGE OF TRUST FUNDS THAT DO NOT EQUAL THE AMOUNT OF EXPOSURE. AND THEN, ALSO, THE ISSUE OF OBTAINING INSURANCE 16 17 FOR THE SITE. I BELIEVE THOSE WERE THE THREE. 18 MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN. CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES. 19 20 MEMBER JONES: AND ALSO THE DEFINITION OF WASTE 21 TIRE TO BE ADDRESSED IN THAT? 2.2 CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE. MEMBER JONES: AND ALONG WITH THAT, ALTERED TIRES 23

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

AND ALL THE DEFINITIONS THAT GO ALONG WITH IT.

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND A COMPLETE AND THOROUGH
REVIEW OF ALL THE DEFINITIONS AS IT RELATES TO THE
DEFINITION OF A TIRE.

MR. BLOCK: AND JUST TO CLARIFY,

THAT WOULD BE TO SUBMIT TO OAL SO WE COULD BEGIN THE 45-DAY

NOTICE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: CORRECT. WHICH IS AN AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION 1999-278.

MS. NAUMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, I REALLY DON'T WANT TO BELABOR THIS, BUT I FEEL IT'S NECESSARY THAT WE HAVE COMPLETE CLARIFICATION, BECAUSE I'M SEEING SOME KIND OF GLAZED LOOKS OVER HERE.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL TAKE CARE OF THAT AS SOON AS THIS MOTION IS TAKEN CARE OF.

MS. NAUMAN: OKAY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY DUE TO
THE LATENESS, WE HAVEN'T TAKEN A BREAK. AND THAT, YOU KNOW,
GROWLING IS TAKING PLACE WITHIN OUR STOMACHS. SO, THAT'S
PROBABLY DUE TO THAT FEELING THAN ANY KIND OF DISCOMFORT
OVER NOT KNOWING.

OKAY. WE HAVE A -- I THINK MR. PENNINGTON MOVES, OR IS ABOUT TO MOVE.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES, I'LL MOVE.

24 MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT.

MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND MR. JONES SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT RESOLUTION 1999-278, THAT INCLUDED THE THREE ITEMS OF SENATOR ROBERTI WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY DESCRIBED, AS WELL AS THE TWO OTHER DEFINITIONAL ITEMS THAT MR. JONES SPOKE OF, AS WELL AS THE OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION AT OUR JULY MEETING.

OKAY. WITHOUT OBJECTION, IF WE CAN SUBSTITUTE THE PREVIOUS ROLL CALL?

WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO SHALL BE ORDERED. ALL 11 RIGHT.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I WOULD LIKE TO CLARIFY --

CHAIRMAN EATON: SURELY.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

(MEMBER PENNINGTON SPEAKS OFF-MIKE.)

MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- FIRST MOTION WHEN I SAID

THAT ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE -- I'M REFERRING TO ENFORCEMENT

WHICH WOULD FALL UNDER THIS EMERGENCY TIRE REGULATION. SO I

HOPE YOU UNDERSTAND I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT ALL ENFORCEMENT

ACTIONS BY THE BOARD BE CEASED, BUT ONLY FOR THOSE

PARTICULAR ITEMS THAT WERE JUST DISCUSSED.

OH, I GUESS I SHOULD TURN MY MICROPHONE ON.

CHAIRMAN EATON: WE NEED SOME FOOD FOR THOUGHT

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

HERE, MS. NAUMAN, YOU KNOW?

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

BUT, ALL RIGHTY, WE'RE ALMOST THROUGH. THE

PLANS ARE -- RIGHT NOW, AT 11:30, WITHOUT TAKING A BREAK, WE

DO HAVE ONE, TWO, THREE QUICK ITEMS THAT WILL COMPLETE THE

PERMITS, LEA AND FACILITY COMPLIANCE PART OF OUR AGENDA. SO

IF WE CAN MOVE THROUGH THOSE THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

AGENDA ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL TO FORMALLY

NOTICE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO UPDATE ENFORCEMENT-RELATED

PROVISIONS IN TITLE 14

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. 4.

MS. HAMBLETON: GOOD MORNING.

CHAIRMAN EATON: GOOD MORNING.

MS. HAMBLETON: MY NAME IS SUZANNE HAMBLETON FROM

14 THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION BRANCH.

ITEM NO. 4 IS CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL TO FORMALLY NOTICE THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO UPDATED ENFORCEMENT-RELATED PROVISIONS OF TITLE 14, AND THAT'S FOR SOLID WASTE.

ATTACHMENT 1 FOR THIS ITEM THAT WAS ON THE BOARD'S WEB PAGE WAS NOT THE LATEST VERSION OF THE REGULATIONS, AND THERE ARE CORRECTED COPIES IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS ITEM IS TO SEEK THE BOARD'S APPROVAL TO BEGIN THE FORMAL RULE-MAKING PROCESS

WHICH COMMENCES WITH THE 45-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR THESE ENFORCEMENT REGULATIONS.

THESE NEW ENFORCEMENT REGULATIONS WERE

DRAFTED TO INCLUDE CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE PASSAGE OF

ASSEMBLY BILL 59 IN 1995, AND OTHER UPDATES TO TITLE 27 AND

TITLE 14 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS.

A WORK GROUP OF LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES,
OTHERWISE KNOWN AS LEAS, AND STAFF DRAFTED AN INITIAL SET OF
REGULATIONS THAT WERE TAKEN TO SOLICIT PUBLIC COMMENT AT TWO
WORKSHOPS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. THE REGS WERE ALSO
DISCUSSED AT THE LEA ROUND-TABLES THROUGHOUT THE STATE. THE
COMMENTS WERE INCORPORATED INTO THE DRAFT THAT IS BEFORE YOU
TODAY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

THE REGULATIONS ADDRESS LEA DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. SPECIFICALLY, HOW THE LEA HANDLES COMPLAINTS OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS, INVESTIGATIONS OF THESE COMPLAINTS, USES OF NOTICING ORDERS, ENUMERATED (PHON) ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS, EMERGENCY ACTIONS BY THE LEA AND THE BOARD. AND, LASTLY, THE REGS PROVIDE FOR THE BOARD TO TAKE ENFORCEMENT ACTION SHOULD THE LEA FAIL TO.

THAT COMPLETES STAFF'S PRESENTATION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS?

I JUST HAVE ONE. ARE THESE

24 CHANGES -- DO WE HAVE ANY CHANGES INCLUDED IN THEM AS A

RESULT OF THE BILL THAT WAS VETOED LAST YEAR? DEALING WITH LEA....

MS. HAMBLETON: I CAN'T -- I'M SEEING MY COLLEAGUE SAYING NO.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I NOTICE IT AFFECTS THE AB 59.

THERE WAS A BILL LAST YEAR THAT WAS PUT IN THE LEGISLATURE

LATE THAT WAS VETOED BECAUSE THERE WAS A CONFLICT. AND I

WAS JUST WONDERING, ARE THERE ANY PROVISIONS IN HERE THAT

RELATE TO THAT? I JUST DON'T KNOW. AND I'M JUST ASKING.

I MEAN, WAS THE ROUND-TABLE SUBSEQUENT TO IT?

BECAUSE I KNOW IT DEALS WITH ISSUES OF NOTICE AND ORDERS,

THREATENS TO CAUSE A CONDITION OF HAZARD, POLLUTION OR

NUISANCE. REMEMBER WE HAD SOME -- AN ISSUE WITH LANGUAGE?

I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE NOT ADOPTING REGULATIONS

THAT WERE PART OF A CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE WHICH HAS YET TO BE

RESOLVED.

I DON'T KNOW, I'M JUST SIMPLY ASKING.

MS. HAMBLETON: I DON'T HAVE THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION EITHER.

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MEMBER JONES: WHAT PAGE ARE YOU ON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M ON PAGE 10 OF THE REGULATION.

MEMBER JONES: THIS LANGUAGE ACTUALLY WHAT WAS IT

24 WAS CHANGED TO.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: YEAH, I DON'T REMEMBER, I'M JUST MEMBER JONES: NO, IT'S A GOOD --CHAIRMAN EATON: -- TRYING TO FIND SOME CLARIFICATION. MEMBER JONES: IT'S A GOOD FIND. BECAUSE, WHAT THE BILL HAD SAID WAS ANY THREAT, OR ANY -- NO, IT WASN'T EVEN SUBSTANTIAL. IT WAS LIKE ANY INDICATION THAT THERE COULD BE -- A PERCEIVED, THE WORD WAS "PERCEIVED," WHICH 10 MEANT LITTER, SITE, THERE WAS ALL SORTS OF CONDITIONS WITH 11 THAT. 12 AND THE FACT THAT THIS IS NOT PERCEIVED, IT'S 13 ACTUAL, AND THAT IT DETERMINES THAT IT'S IN (PHONETIC), I 14 THINK THAT WAS A HUGE PART OF THE CONTENTION. 15 THE OTHER WAS THAT THE -- RIGHT NOW THE LAW ALLOWS \$5,000 FINES THROUGH AB 59. THIS DOESN'T 16 17 CHANGE THAT, THIS STAYS THE SAME. I THINK THAT BILL WANTED 18 THE RIGHT TO GO UP TO 20 GRAND OR 25 GRAND, IT WAS A HECK OF 19 A LOT OF MONEY. BECAUSE IT WAS ANY THREE VIOLATIONS, 20 AND IF THOSE THREE VIOLATIONS WERE PRETTY MINOR IT'S -- IT 21 WAS A PROBLEM. SO, THOSE ARE OUT. 22 I LOOKED AT THESE, I DIDN'T --23 CHAIRMAN EATON: THE OFF-SITE LITTER, DID YOU LOOK 24 AT --

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE WEREN'T GOING IN JUST -- THERE'S NOTHING THERE, BUT THERE WAS A BILL LAST YEAR THAT CREATED SOME CONTROVERSY AT THE END OF THE LEGISLATIVE SESSION THAT WERE ITEMS THAT THE WORKING GROUP -- THE PREVIOUS WORKING GROUP HAD WORKED ON, AND THAT THERE WAS SOME THINGS, AND THE BILL WAS VETOED, AND IT WAS OVER SOME PARTICULAR LANGUAGE.

I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE WEREN'T PUTTING SOME OF THAT IN OUR REGULATIONS AND, THEREFORE, CAUSING OURSELVES MUCH FURTHER GRIEF UNTIL THAT ISSUE HAS RESOLVED ITSELF. BUT, YOU KNOW, I WAS JUST ASKING THE OUESTION JUST FOR CLARIFICATION PURPOSES.

MS. HAMBLETON: AND I CAN CERTAINLY CHECK ON THAT AND MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE NOT DOING THAT.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL MOVE
ADOPTION OF -- I DON'T HAVE A RESOLUTION --

MS. HAMBLETON: ACTUALLY, THERE IS NO RESOLUTION,
BECAUSE THIS IS GOING OUT FOR THE --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OH. YEAH, OKAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- 45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL MOVE WE SUBMIT THESE FOR

23 45-DAY COMMENT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHTY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND MR. JONES SECONDS THAT THE CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL TO FORMALLY NOTICE PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO UPDATE ENFORCEMENT-RELATED PROVISIONS IN TITLE 14 BE ADOPTED.

WITHOUT OBJECTION, WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PREVIOUS ROLL CALL. HEARING NO OBJECTIONS, SO SHALL BE ORDERED.

AGENDA ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE

FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE FORWARD LANDFILL, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM 9.

MR. KEFFER: GOOD MORNING MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. MY NAME IS MICHAEL KEFFER, I AM HERE THIS MORNING REPRESENTING THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION BRANCH. SEATED AT THE TABLE IN FRONT OF YOU IS MR. ROBERT MCCLELLAN, REPRESENTING SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 9 REQUESTS THAT THE BOARD'S CONSIDERATION OF A REVISION TO THE SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR FORWARD LANDFILL LOCATED IN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY.

FORWARD LANDFILL IS AN EXISTING CLASS II AND CLASS III LANDFILL, PRESENTLY OPERATING UNDER A 1994 SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT WHICH ALLOWS A MAXIMUM DAILY TONNAGE OF 4,180 TONS. UNDER THE 1994 PERMIT THE BOARD IS PERMITTED TO ACCEPT NUMEROUS DESIGNATED WASTES, INCLUDING PETROLEUM-

CONTAMINATED SOIL, SLUDGE, AND ASH. THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VEHICLES ALLOWED TO TRANSPORT WASTE TO FORWARD EACH DAY IS 435.

DURING THE PAST FIVE YEARS THE OPERATOR HAS

DETERMINED THE AVERAGE WEIGHT OF VEHICLES ARRIVING AT

FORWARD TO BE GREATER THAN ORIGINALLY ESTIMATED. THIS

INCREASE IN WEIGHT PER VEHICLE IS THE RESULT OF DENSER WASTE

MATERIALS BEING TRANSPORTED TO FORWARD, MORE SPECIFICALLY

CONTAMINATED SOIL AND SLUDGE.

FORWARD HAS PROPOSED A REVISION TO THEIR SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT, INCREASING THE MAXIMUM DAILY TONNAGE TO 6,680 TONS. NO INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF VEHICLE IS REQUESTED IN THE REVISED PERMIT.

BOARD STAFF CONDUCTED A PRE-PERMIT INSPECTION ON JUNE 9TH, 1999, ACCOMPANIED BY

MR. MCCLELLAN AND MR. BUTCH STEPHANIE (PHON), THE OPERATIONS

MANAGER AT FORWARD LANDFILL. NO VIOLATIONS OF STATE MINIMUM

STANDARDS WERE OBSERVED DURING THE INSPECTION. STAFF ALSO

REVIEWED THE LEA INSPECTION RECORDS FOR FORWARD OVER THE

PAST TWO YEARS AND FOUND NO VIOLATIONS OF STATE MINIMUM

STANDARDS HAD BEEN INDICATED.

THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT, ACTING AS LEAD AGENCY, PREPARED A MITIGATED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE

MAXIMUM DAILY TONNAGE AT FORWARD AND HAD IT DISTRIBUTED TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES.

THE BOARD'S CEQA STAFF, AFTER REVIEWING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED AND SENT A LETTER TO THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND TO THE LEAD AGENCY DATED JANUARY 13TH, 1999, WITH NO COMMENTS ON THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OR THE PROJECT PROPOSAL.

THE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE MECHANISMS FOR
FORWARD LANDFILL WERE EVALUATED BY BOARD STAFF AND
DETERMINED TO BE ADEQUATE FOR CLOSURE/POST-CLOSURE
MAINTENANCE AND FOR OPERATING LIABILITY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

FINDINGS OF CONFORMANCE WITH THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN APPROVED BY THE BOARD IN MARCH OF 1997 WAS DEFERRED TO THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE.

MR. ZANE POULSON WILL REPRESENT -- OR, EXCUSE ME, WILL PRESENT THEIR FINDINGS AT THIS TIME.

MR. POULSON: GOOD MORNING CHAIRMAN EATON AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. I'M ZANE POULSON WITH THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE, CENTRAL SECTION.

AFTER REVIEWING THE COUNTY'S SITING ELEMENT AND THE PROPOSED PERMIT REVISION, STAFF AND THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE HAVE MADE THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS.

THE SITING ELEMENT STATES THAT THE FACILITY

RECEIVES A MAXIMUM DAILY TONNAGE OF 4,180 TONS PER DAY, THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS FOR 6,680 TONS PER DAY. AND THE SITING ELEMENT DOES NOT DISCUSS ANY PLANS FOR EXPANDING THE FACILITY.

BOARD STAFF, THEREFORE, CONCLUDE THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE COUNTY'S SITING ELEMENT.

BASED ON THE BOARD'S DIRECTION AT THE JANUARY 21ST, 1999, BOARD MEETING, PRIOR TO ADOPTING A POLICY ON PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 50001, THE BOARD WILL CONSIDER, AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE EFFECT OF THE CHANGES ON THE COUNTY'S 15-YEAR DISPOSAL CAPACITY WHEN CONSIDERING A REVISED PERMIT. ACCORDING TO BOARD STAFF REVIEW, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY WILL CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN 15 YEARS OF COMBINED EXISTING AND PLANNED DISPOSAL CAPACITY.

2.2

I ALSO WANT TO NOTE THAT IF THE BOARD CONCURS
IN THE PROPOSED PERMIT REVISION, THE RESOLUTION, AS IT IS
CURRENTLY WRITTEN, WILL BE REVISED TO REFLECT THE BOARD'S
DIRECTION TO STAFF RELATED TO THE CONFORMANCE FINDINGS.
SPECIFICALLY, THE LAST "WHEREAS" WILL STAY:

"WHEREAS, THE BOARD FINDS THAT ALL STATE AND LOCAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED PERMIT HAVE BEEN MET, INCLUDING CONSISTENCY WITH THE BOARD'S STANDARDS, CONFORMANCE WITH THE INTENT OF THE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN SITING

ELEMENT, TO PROVIDE 15 YEARS OF DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR THE COUNTY, AND COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA."

IN CONCLUSION, THE PERMIT REVISION IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE SITING ELEMENT AND THE DECISION OF CONFORMANCE IS LEFT TO THE BOARD.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS OF OUR STAFF OR MR. POULSON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THE COUNTY APPROVED THIS,

THOUGH, CORRECT? THE COUNTY HAS APPROVED THIS PERMIT

12 REVISION?

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY.

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

YARD BECAUSE IT IS DIRT.

MEMBER JONES: THIS GOES TO WHAT WE'RE GOING TO BE

17 WORKING ON IN TWO DAYS, ABOUT WHAT IS AN EXPANSION.

THERE'S THE SAME NUMBER OF VEHICLES THAT ARE COMING IN, WE'RE NOT ADDING VEHICLES. WE'RE NOT ADDING ANY LATERAL -- ANY CHANGE TO THE FOOTPRINT. WE'RE JUST RECOGNIZING THAT THE WASTE STREAM DOESN'T WEIGH 650 POUNDS PER COMPACTED CUBIC YARD, BUT, IN FACT, WEIGHS A TON PER

AND SO, REALLY THE ISSUE -- AND BELIEVE ME,

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

ZANE, YOUR CONFORMANCE FINDING WORKS FOR ME. IT MAKES SENSE, YOU ARE FOLLOWING OUR DIRECTION.

BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T SAY 6,000-WHATEVER THE TONS WERE IN THE SITING ELEMENT MAKES IT NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE -- NOT IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE SITING ELEMENT. CORRECT?

BUT, THOSE ARE REALLY THE DIFFERENCES.

MR. POULSON: YES.

MEMBER JONES: THANKS.

MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES.

MEMBER JONES: IF THERE'S NOBODY ELSE TO TALK?

CHAIRMAN EATON: DO YOU HAVE THAT LITTLE AMENDMENT

WRITTEN?

10

11

12

13

15

21

MR. POULSON: YES, I DO.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. COULD YOU BRING IT HERE SO

16 MR. JONES CAN --

17 MEMBER JONES: CAN YOU BRING THAT HERE, SO HE

18 DOESN'T MAKE ME MAKE THIS UP AND REPEAT IT?

19 CHAIRMAN EATON: I WANT TO BE EXACT PRETTY MUCH ON

20 POINT.

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

22 MEMBER JONES: ALL RIGHT. MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD

23 LIKE TO MOVE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION -- YEAH, THANKS, AT

24 LEAST YOU ASKED FOR A COPY THIS TIME, USUALLY YOU MAKE ME

REREAD THEM -- RESOLUTION 1999-259, TO INCLUDE ON THE LAST "WHEREAS":

"WHEREAS, THE BOARD FINDS THAT ALL STATE AND LOCAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED PERMIT HAVE BEEN MET, INCLUDING CONSISTENCY WITH THE BOARD'S STANDARDS, CONFORMANCE WITH THE INTENT OF THE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN SITING ELEMENT, TO PROVIDE 15 YEARS OF DISPOSAL CAPACITY FOR THE COUNTY, AND COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA."

THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ACT.

MEMBER JONES: ACT.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL SECOND IT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHTY. MR. JONES MOVES AND MR. PENNINGTON SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT RESOLUTION 1999-259, AS AMENDED.

MADAM SECRETARY, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE

18 ROLL?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

MEMBER JONES: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI?

MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE.

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

AGENDA ITEM 10: CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE

FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE TEHACHAPI SANITARY LANDFILL, KERN

COUNTY

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. 10, THE LAST ITEM WITHIN THE CATEGORY OF PERMITS.

MS. ROSALES: GOOD MORNING BOARD MEMBERS AND MR. CHAIRMAN. I'M VIRGINIA ROSALES WITH THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION BRANCH. PRESENT FROM THE LEA'S OFFICE IS MR. MIKE NECO (PHON), CHIEF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER WITH THE KERN COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 10 IS A REVISED PERMIT FOR THE Tehachapi SANITARY LANDFILL. THE FACILITY HAS BEEN IN OPERATION SINCE 1973, WAS PERMITTED IN 1978, AND IS CURRENTLY OPERATING UNDER THAT EXISTING PERMIT. THE FACILITY IS OWNED AND OPERATED BY THE KERN COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT.

IN SUMMARY, THE PROPOSED CHANGES ARE: TO

INCREASE THE PERMITTED TONNAGE FROM 32 TONS PER DAY TO 370

TONS PER DAY; INCREASE THE PERMITTED AREA FROM 40 ACRES TO

145 ACRES AND, MORE SIGNIFICANTLY, DEFINE THE DISPOSAL

FOOTPRINT TO BE 31.7 ACRES; THE ENLARGEMENT OF THE PERMITTED

AREA IS TO ALLOW FOR A BUFFER, SOIL (INDISCERNIBLE),

DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, AND INSTALLATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING EQUIPMENT; CHANGE THE HOURS OF OPERATION, CHANGE THE NAME OF THE OPERATOR FROM KERN COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT TO KERN COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT; THE ADDITION OF THE GATE HOUSE; GAS AND GROUND WATER MONITORING;

A LOAD-CHECKING PROGRAM; SPECIFY THE USE OF TARPS AS ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER; AND, SPECIFY THE FACILITY PRIMARILY RECEIVES RESIDUAL WASTE FROM THE Tehachapi MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY.

AS AN UPDATE TO THE AGENDA ITEM, STAFF HAVE

NOW DETERMINED THAT THE RDSI IS COMPLETE, AS CERTIFIED BY

THE LEA; THE OPERATING LIABILITY IS ACCEPTABLE; AND, THE

CLOSURE FUND IS ADEQUATELY FUNDED. THE ENVIRONMENTAL

DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT ARE ADEQUATE FOR

THE BOARD'S EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

2.2

2.3

ANOTHER MATTER TO BE DETERMINED WAS

CONFORMANCE WITH THE COUNTY'S INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT

PLAN. STAFF FROM THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE WILL

ADDRESS THIS MATTER MOMENTARILY.

IN CONCLUSION, WE ARE UNABLE TO FORMULATE A
RECOMMENDATION BASED UPON STAFF'S DETERMINATION OF THE
CONFORMANCE FINDING. HOWEVER, IF THE BOARD FINDS
CONFORMANCE WITH THE INTENT OF THE COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED
WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN, STAFF HAVE -- STAFF FIND THE PROPOSED

PERMIT IS ACCEPTABLE FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE. CONSIDERING THAT POSSIBILITY, WE HAVE PREPARED A PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 1999-260, FOR CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF SOLID WASTE FACILITIES PERMIT 15-AA-0062. I BELIEVE ALL OF YOU HAVE RECEIVED COPIES OF THAT RESOLUTION, AND COPIES ARE ON THE BACK TABLE. CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS OF STAFF? OKAY. MS. ROSALES: I WILL MENTION, ALSO, THAT MS. NANCY EVERT FROM THE OPERATOR IS ALSO --10 CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT. 11 MS. ROSALES: -- PRESENT IN THE AUDIENCE, IF YOU 12 HAVE ANY QUESTIONS. 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: WE'RE JUST LOOKING FOR THE 14 RESOLUTIONS THAT WERE -- THAT YOU HAD MENTIONED. 15 (SOME MEMBERS CONFER OFF-MIKE.) 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: WE HAVE THE OPERATOR, IN CASE --17 I JUST -- WE'RE READY TO MOVE THE ITEM, I BELIEVE, AFTER 18 EVERYONE'S LOOKED AT THE RESOLUTION. 19 MS. EVERT, DO YOU CARE TO STILL SPEAK, OR --20 MS. EVERT: YES. 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. THEN WHILE EVERYONE'S KIND 2.2 OF GETTING A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THAT RESOLUTION IT MIGHT BE -23 24 MS. EVERT: CHAIRMAN EATON, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

THE KERN COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT IS VERY PLEASED

TO BRING THE Tehachapi REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES PERMIT

BEFORE YOU.

YOU MAY RECALL OVER THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS

KERN COUNTY HAS BROUGHT SIX PERMITS BEFORE YOU, Tehachapi IS

THE SEVENTH. AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO BRINGING THE MOJAVE

SANITARY LANDFILL BEFORE YOU SOMETIME IN THE NEXT YEAR.

THAT WILL COMPLETE UPDATING ALL OF OUR 1978 PERMITS, AND

WE'LL BE VERY HAPPY WHEN THAT IS ACCOMPLISHED.

THE Tehachapi SANITARY LANDFILL. WE HAVE INCREASED THE LANDFILL FACILITY BOUNDARY, AND THAT IS TO INCLUDE DETENTION BASINS, DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, TO BE ABLE TO PUT IN OUR UPGRADING IN GROUND WATER MONITORING POINTS, AND ALSO SOME GAS MONITORING POINTS.

2.2

THE LANDFILL FOOTPRINT WILL REMAIN THE SAME.

THE 31.7 ACRES, THAT HAS BEEN OUR -- PERMITTED SINCE 1978.

WE WILL BE OPERATING WITHIN THAT SAME PERMIT. AND OUR

LANDFILL WILL CLOSE SOMETIME AROUND THE YEAR 2007.

THE PERMIT CAPACITY HAS INCREASED ON A

AVERAGE DAILY TONNAGE, AND THAT IS SO THAT WE CAN INCLUDE

ADDITIONAL WASTE THAT IS COMING, AND COMING THROUGH THE

Tehachapi RECYCLING FACILITY. IT HAS INCREASED THE WASTE

SHED THAT IS ALLOWED TO COME THROUGH Tehachapi RECYCLING,

AND THEN WITH RESIDUALS BEING DISPOSED OF AT THE Tehachapi

LANDFILL.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

AND, WE'VE HAD CONCURRENT DROPS IN OUR BORON
LANDFILL AND OUR MOJAVE LANDFILL AS WE BRING THE WASTE
THROUGH THE MOJAVE -- EXCUSE ME, THROUGH THE Tehachapi
RECYCLING FACILITY, AND THEN TO THE Tehachapi LANDFILL.

SOUTHEAST KERN COUNTY IS NOW ACHIEVING 60 TO 70% DIVERSION BECAUSE OF THIS FACILITY, AND WE THINK IT'S A WIN-WIN FOR THE REGION, AND FOR KERN COUNTY DIVERSION OVERALL.

SO, WE THANK YOU FOR LOOKING AT OUR PERMIT,
AND LOOK FORWARD TO, HOPEFULLY, HAVING CONCURRENCE ON IT.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS I'LL BE
HAPPY TO ANSWER THEM.

CHAIRMAN EATON: DO WE NEED AN EXPLANATION ON THE CONFORMANCE ISSUE? JUST TO BRING THE ISSUE -- AS WE DID IN THE LAST --

MS. NAUMAN: I THINK JUST TO MAKE THE RECORD COMPLETE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY, LET'S DO THAT THEN.

MR. POULSON: GOOD MORNING AGAIN, I'M ZANE POULSON OF THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE, CENTRAL SECTION.

AND AFTER REVIEWING THE COUNTY'S SITING
ELEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED REVISION, AND THE PROPOSED
REVISION, STAFF AND THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE HAVE MADE

THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS.

IN THE SITING ELEMENT IT

DESCRIBES THE FACILITY AS A 40-ACRE FACILITY

WHICH RECEIVES 32 TONS PER DAY. AND THE SITING ELEMENT DOES

NOT DISCUSS ANY EXPANSIONS OF THIS FACILITY. AND THE

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITING ELEMENT IS THE SAME AS THE

DESCRIPTION IN THE CURRENT PERMIT, BUT IT DIFFERS FROM THE

DESCRIPTION IN THE PROPOSED REVISION.

AND, THEREFORE, BOARD STAFF CONCLUDES THAT
THE PROPOSED PERMIT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE KERN COUNTY
SITING ELEMENT. AND, BASED ON THE BOARD'S DIRECTION IN THE
JANUARY 21ST, 1999, BOARD MEETING, PRIOR TO ADOPTING A
POLICY ON PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 50001, THE BOARD
WILL CONSIDER, AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE EFFECT ON THE
COUNTY'S -- OF THE CHANGE ON THE COUNTY'S 15-YEAR DISPOSAL
CAPACITY IN CONSIDERING THE REVISED PERMIT.

ACCORDING TO THE BOARD STAFF'S REVIEW, KERN
COUNTY WILL CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN 15 YEARS OF COMBINED
EXISTING AND PLANNED DISPOSAL CAPACITY. BECAUSE THE
ADDITIONAL WASTE IS EXPECTED TO BE DIVERTED FROM OTHER
LANDFILLS WITHIN KERN COUNTY, SPECIFICALLY THE MOJAVE, AND
THE BORON LANDFILLS, AND WASTE BEING RECEIVED AT THE
Tehachapi LANDFILL IS FIRST DIVERTED THROUGH THE Tehachapi
MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY, THE COUNTY'S DISPOSAL CAPACITY

IS NOT EXPECTED TO DECREASE, AND MAY ACTUALLY INCREASE AS A RESULT THE PERMIT.

IN CONCLUSION, THE PERMIT REVISION IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE SITING ELEMENT, AND THE DECISION OF CONFORMANCE IS LEFT TO THE BOARD.

CHAIRMAN EATON: QUESTIONS?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: SINCE DAPHNE WASHINGTON, THE DIRECTOR OF THE KERN COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION, IS AN OLD RACING BUDDY OF MINE, I'D LIKE TO MOVE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 260.

CHAIRMAN EATON: I THINK THAT'S A

14 WELL-ADVISED MOVE. OKAY.

AND I'LL SECOND THE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

16 1999-260.

17 MADAM SECRETARY, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE

18 ROLL?

10

11

12

13

2.2

23

19 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

20 MEMBER JONES: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI?

24 MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE.

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE.

ALL RIGHT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IT'S ABOUT FIVE TO 12:00, THAT COMPLETES THIS MORNING'S WORK.

ONE OTHER ITEM THAT YOU SHOULD BE AWARE OF,
ITEM NO. 17 HAS ALSO BEEN PULLED FOR THIS AFTERNOON'S
SESSION. ITEM 17 HAS BEEN PULLED. SO, WE COME BACK AT
1:30. WE

WILL TAKE UP WITH ITEM NO. 12, WHICH IS THE CONSIDERATION OF THE TIRE REPORT.

WE STAND IN RECESS UNTIL 1:30.

(WHEREUPON, THE LUNCHEON RECESS IS TAKEN.)

13

14

10

12

AFTERNOON SESSION

-- 000 --

CHAIRMAN EATON: WELCOME BACK EVERYONE. HOPEFULLY
YOU HAD A LIGHT LUNCH, IN THE HEAT.

BEFORE WE BEGIN I WILL ASK ANY OF MY COLLEAGUES IF THEY HAVE ANY EX PARTES TO REPORT.

MEMBER JONES: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, I DO.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THERE'S NO HIDDEN MEANING THAT WE DIDN'T WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU.

MEMBER JONES: MINE ARE QUICK. I FORGOT PAUL RYAN
THIS MORNING ON SOME BASE-YEAR AND SOME DISPOSAL REPORTING
ISSUES.

AND THEN TWO MINUTES AGO CHUCK HELGUT (PHON)
REALLY QUICKLY ON THE WORKSHOP THAT WE'RE HAVING THURSDAY.
AND CHUCK WHITE ON MY FAVORITE SUBJECT LATELY, INERTS.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANYONE ELSE?

17 I JUST HAD A QUICK HELLO TO CHUCK HELGUT --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: ME TOO.

19 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- BUT NOTHING OF ANY REAL....

20 ALL RIGHTY.

21 //

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

22 //

23 //

24 LEGISLATION:

CALIFORNIA SHORTHAND REPORTING

AGENDA ITEM 12: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL REPORT ON THE CALIFORNIA WASTE TIRE PROGRAM IN RESPONSE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF AB 117 (ESCUTIA)

CHAIRMAN EATON: WE'LL GO RIGHT TO OUR AGENDA ITEM NO. 12, CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL REPORT ON THE CALIFORNIA WASTE TIRE PROGRAM IN RESPONSE TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASSEMBLY BILL 117.

MR. FITZGERALD: MR. CHAIRMAN --

CHAIRMAN EATON: BEFORE YOU BEGIN, I JUST REMIND ANYONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ON ANY OF THE MATTERS THAT ARE GOING TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD THIS AFTERNOON, IF YOU'LL KINDLY JUST FILL OUT A SLIP IN THE BACK AND BRING IT FORWARD WITH THE AGENDA ITEM IN THE UPPER RIGHT-HAND CORNER AND GIVE IT TO MS. DOMINGUEZ, WHO'S ON MY LEFT AND TO YOUR RIGHT, AND SHE'LL MAKE SURE THAT I GET IT AND BE ABLE TO RECOGNIZE YOU AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME.

SORRY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. FITZGERALD: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, IT LOOKS LIKE WE'VE FINALLY ARRIVED AT THE CONSIDERATION OF THE FINAL REPORT ON THE TIRE PROGRAM. THIS REPORT IS DUE AT THE LEGISLATURE AND THE GOVERNOR ON THE 30TH OF JUNE, SO WE HAVE A WEEK AFTER TODAY'S MEETING.

MEMBER JONES: WHO ARE YOU?

MR. FITZGERALD: I'M BYRON FITZGERALD WITH THE

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: THEY GET AWFULLY BOLD, DON'T THEY, ONCE THEY MOVE INTO A SPECIAL CATEGORY.

MR. FITZGERALD: I KNEW THERE WAS SOMETHING I'D MISSED THERE.

TODAY I DON'T INTEND TO GO THROUGH THE REPORT IN DETAIL, BECAUSE I THINK ALL OF YOU HAVE BEEN THROUGH IT AT LEAST THREE TIMES. HOWEVER, IF YOU SO DESIRE, I SHALL DO IT. BUT, THE REPORT DOES COVER REMEDIATION OF ILLEGAL SITES, ENFORCEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT OF MARKETS.

I DISTRIBUTED THIS MORNING TO YOUR OFFICES A LIST OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE REPORT, AND I APOLOGIZE FOR GETTING THAT LIST OUT SO LATE, AND NOT GIVING YOU A LOT OF TIME TO LOOK AT IT.

MOST OF THE CHANGES IN THERE ARE STRICTLY

ADMINISTRATIVE-TYPE THINGS. I THINK YOU'VE ALREADY WADED

THROUGH THE DIFFICULTY IN DEFINITIONS, AND HOW ONE

DEFINITION IS HOOKED INTO ANOTHER. A LOT OF THESE CHANGES

CAME UP WHEN WE STARTED TALKING WITH THE LEGISLATIVE SIDE OF

THE HOUSE, AND THINGS THAT WERE NEEDED TO CLARIFY WHAT WE

HAD MEANT.

SO, IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS IN THE PROPOSED CHANGES I WOULD CERTAINLY ENTERTAIN THOSE, ANY COMMENTS OF QUESTIONS ON THOSE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS OF MR. FITZGERALD WITH REGARD --MR. FITZGERALD: TO ANY CHANGES? CHAIRMAN EATON: -- TO CHANGES? MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN? CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON. MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES. I'D LIKE TO INQUIRE AS TO THE REASONING, IF THERE IS ANY, BEHIND THE USE OF -- OR, THE INCLUSION OF BALED TIRES IN THE DEFINITION OF AN 10 ALTERNATE WASTE TIRE. 11 MR. FITZGERALD: THE BOARD, IN --CHAIRMAN EATON: IS THAT ON PAGE -- IS THAT THE 12 13 PAGE 46 DEFINITION? 14 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) 15 MR. FITZGERALD: IT'S PAGE 46, ALTERED WASTE TIRE 16 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. MR. FITZGERALD: -- "MEANS A WASTE TIRE THAT IS NO 18 19 LONGER WHOLE, " ETC., ETC. 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. 21 MR. FITZGERALD: THE REASON BALED TIRES ARE 2.2 INCLUDED IS THAT THE BOARD PASSED A RESOLUTION IN APPROXIMATELY 1992 WHICH RAISED THIS, AND INCLUDED BALED 23 24 TIRES IN THE DEFINITION OF ALTERED TIRES. AND THAT IS WHY I PUT IT IN THERE.

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DON'T BELIEVE
THAT A TIRE THAT'S BALED NECESSARY ALTERS THE TIRE. SO I
WOULD ASK THAT WE REMOVE THE INCLUSION OF BALED TIRES IN
THAT DEFINITION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: SO WOULD THE WHOLE -- ARE YOU

RECOMMENDING THAT THE WHOLE SENTENCE BE DELETED? BECAUSE I

THINK IT SPEAKS JUST TO --

MR. FITZGERALD: IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE JUST TO DROP
OUT THE STATEMENT THAT --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: YEAH.

MR. FITZGERALD: -- ALTERED TIRES INCLUDE BALED

13 TIRES. YOU CAN JUST DROP THAT OUT --

14 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YEAH. THAT WORKS FINE WITH 15 ME.

MEMBER JONES: THEN WHERE -- I MEAN, QUESTION?

CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE. I'M JUST --

MEMBER JONES: WHERE WOULD WE PUT BALED TIRES

THEN? I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH DROPPING IT AS ALTERED,

AS LONG AS WE HAVE ANOTHER SPOT THAT WE CAN PUT IT IN.

BECAUSE BALED TIRES RIGHT NOW, AS I UNDERSTAND, THAT PROCESS -- AND I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, IT'S A WHOLE TIRE. IF THE BANDING BREAKS THEN YOU'VE GOT WHOLE TIRES THAT ARE IS THINKING THERE.

BUT, UNDER OUR REGS, I THINK THAT YOU CAN
LANDFILL BALED TIRES BECAUSE OF A SOURCE -- I DON'T KNOW IF
IT WAS SOURCE REDUCTION OR COMPRESSION FINDING THAT HAPPENED
BACK IN THE '90S, BUT IT WAS SOMETHING THAT ALLOWED THAT.

SO, WHERE DO WE PUT THAT?

2.2

MR. FITZGERALD: WELL, I'M NOT SURE THAT YOU NEED IT, BECAUSE EVERY OTHER TYPE OF TIRE IS DEFINED. I MEAN, IT'S -- IT WOULD BE DEFINED IN SOME OTHER FASHION. YOU KNOW, IT WOULD EITHER BE A (INDISCERNIBLE) TIRE, OR IT WOULD BE ALTERED IN SOME FASHION OTHER THAN JUST BALING IT.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY. BUT ARE WE SAYING THAT IF WE TAKE THE DEFINITION OF BALED TIRES OUT OF ALTERED TIRES ARE WE STILL GOING TO BE ABLE TO BALE TIRES?

MR. CHANDLER: I THINK YOU COULD CERTAINLY BALE TIRES FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.

I THINK WHAT -- IF I UNDERSTAND THE

IMPLICATIONS OF MR. PENNINGTON'S PROPOSED SUGGESTION, OR

MOTION, IN ONE RESPECT WOULD BE THAT RIGHT NOW YOU CAN

LANDFILL A TIRE IF IT'S ALTERED. IF A TIRE IS DEFINED AS

BEING ALTERED WHEN IT'S IN A BALED STATE, THEN YOU CAN

LANDFILL BALED TIRES. IF WE TAKE OUT WHAT IS INCLUDED AS AN

ALTERED TIRE TO BE A BALE, THEN YOU WOULD NO LONGER BE

ALLOWED TO CONSIDER A BALED TIRE, MEANING THE DEFINITION OF

AN ALTERED TIRE, WHICH CAN THEN GO INTO A LANDFILL.

SO, THE NET EFFECT WOULD BE, YOU WOULD BE REMOVING BALED TIRES FROM GOING TO LAND DISPOSALS. MR. FITZGERALD: IF THE BALES WERE MADE OF WHOLE TIRES --(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) MR. CHANDLER: CORRECT. MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- MADE OF WHOLE TIRES. MEMBER JONES: THEN I'D HAVE A HARD TIME SUPPORTING THAT. BECAUSE, WE'RE CLEANING UP A TIRE CLEANUP 10 11 MR. FITZGERALD: I'M JUST TRYING TO GIVE THE 12 IMPLICATIONS --13 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) 14 MEMBER JONES: NO, AND -- BUT THAT'S WHY I WANT TO 15 KNOW WHERE ELSE IT WOULD HAVE TO GO, SO THAT WE COULD CONTINUE TO --16 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: BUT ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS TO 18 ALTER THEM IN ANOTHER FASHION, BALING IT, TAKE THE BEAD (PHONETIC) OUT OF IT, AND THEN YOU DON'T HAVE A WHOLE TIRE, 19 20 THEN YOU HAVE AN ALTERED WASTE TIRE. 21 MEMBER JONES: UNDERSTOOD. BUT IT'S --2.2 MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- YOU COULD BALE THAT, BUT --23 MEMBER JONES: BUT WHAT DOES THAT EFFECTIVELY DO, OTHER THAN DRIVE THE COST UP? 24

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, SO --(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) MEMBER JONES: THAT'S ALL IT DOES IS --MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- BALING IT --MEMBER JONES: -- DRIVE THE COST UP. MEMBER PENNINGTON: BALING IT DRIVES THE COST UP, TOO. MEMBER JONES: NOT -- WELL, IT DOES AND IT DOESN'T, IT DEPENDS ON HOW MUCH YOU'RE GOING TO ADD TO THAT. 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YOU MEAN HOW MUCH -- YOU MEAN 11 HOW MANY TIRES YOU'RE GOING TO BALE, OR --12 MEMBER JONES: NO. I MEAN, YOU CAN'T --MEMBER PENNINGTON: IT COSTS SOMETHING TO BALE IT 13 14 15 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) MEMBER JONES: RIGHT. BUT THERE'S A POSITIVE USE 16 17 FOR BALED TIRES, TOO. 18 MEMBER ROBERTI: MR. CHAIRMAN? 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: SENATOR ROBERTI. 20 MEMBER ROBERTI: JUST TO ADD MY TWO CENTS, I DON'T 21 UNDERSTAND OUR CURRENT DEFINITION, MYSELF, AS TO WHY WOULD 2.2 WE SAY THAT A BALED TIRE IS AN ALTERED TIRE. IT JUST 23 STRIKES ME -- I MEAN, YOU HAVE ALL THESE TIRES COMPRESSED 24 TOGETHER AND GOING INTO THE LANDFILL, ALL THE PROBLEMS OF A

SINGULAR LAND -- TIRE GOING INTO A LANDFILL ARE COMPOUNDED NOW, BECAUSE NOW YOU'VE JUST PUT THEM ALL TOGETHER.

SO, INSTEAD OF SAYING A BALED TIRE IS AN ALTERED TIRE, IT STRIKES ME AS EVEN A BIGGER PROBLEM THAN THE TIRE THAT CURRENTLY IS NOT ALLOWED INTO A LANDFILL. SO, I THINK OUR DEFINITION OUGHT TO CHANGE, MYSELF.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. FITZGERALD, DO YOU HAVE ANY BACKGROUND IN TERMS OF HOW THIS AROSE?

BECAUSE, MY UNDERSTANDING IS, IS THAT, FROM MY SHEET, IT LOOKS LIKE ONE WORD WAS TO BE DELETED,
"GRANULATED," AND NOW WE HAVE OTHER WORDS. SO --

MR. FITZGERALD: WELL, THE --

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- IS THERE SOME CONTEXT BY WHICH
WE CAN UNDERSTAND PERHAPS SOME OF THE ISSUE, OR HOW IT
AROSE?

MR. FITZGERALD: THE ISSUE BASICALLY IS -(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

19 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- THE WORKING GROUPS OR PUBLIC

20 INPUT?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

MR. FITZGERALD: NO, THIS PRECEDES THE WORKING GROUPS.

23 AND IT -- LIKE I SAY, IT GOES BACK TO ABOUT 1992. AND THE ISSUE IS, CAN YOU LANDFILL WHOLE TIRES THAT

HAVE BEEN BALED, THAT'S -- THAT IS THE ISSUE. AND AT THE
TIME THE BOARD PASSED A RESOLUTION THAT THEY CONSIDERED
BALED TIRES AS BEING ALTERED TIRES, WHICH DID ALLOW FOR THE
LANDFILLING OF WHOLE TIRES THAT HAD BEEN BALED.

AND THE BOARD, OBVIOUSLY, CAN CHANGE THEIR -- CAN CHANGE THAT AT THIS TIME.

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: TO A COUPLE OF SENATOR ROBERTI'S

10 ISSUES?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

IT -- WHOLE TIRES, WHEN THEY WENT INTO A LANDFILL AS PART OF A LOAD WORK THEIR WAY UP THROUGH THE GROUND.

MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH, I UNDERSTAND THAT.

MEMBER JONES: BALED TIRES THAT ARE BALED AND STRAPPED, AND COMPRESSED, GET PUT IN PLACE AND GET COVERED, THEY DON'T WORK THEMSELVES UP THROUGH THE GROUND, THEY STAY IN THAT DENSIFIED FORM EVEN IF THOSE BALE STRAPS BREAK.

AND, THAT WAS PART OF THE REASON THAT WHOLE TIRES WEREN'T ABLE TO GO IN THE LANDFILLS, BECAUSE THEY SURFACED, AND YOU COULD SEE 20 OR 30 OF THEM ON THE FACE ALL THE TIME THAT HAD POPPED UP. WHEN THEY'RE BALED THEY DON'T HAVE THAT TENDENCY TO POP UP.

BUT THE CLEANUP THAT HAPPENED AT -- THE

CLEANUP THAT HAPPENED AT --

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MEMBER JONES: -- THE GUY IN --

MR. FITZGERALD: WINDBERRY (PHON)?

MEMBER JONES: WINDBERRY HAD BALED TIRES FOR THE PURPOSES OF TRANSPORTING THEM, OR USING THEM FOR SHOOTING, A SHOOTING RANGE BACKSTOPS, THOSE TYPES OF THINGS, IT'S A POSITIVE USE, THAT WENT BELLY-UP, WE HAD TO CLEAN IT UP. BECAUSE THOSE WERE BALED TIRES THEY WENT IN -- THEY COULD GO INTO A SITE. THAT CUT OUR COSTS CONSIDERABLY TO REMEDIATE THAT SITE, OR CUT THEIR COSTS CONSIDERABLY TO REMEDIATE THAT SITE.

THERE ARE SOME AWFULLY GOOD USES FOR BALED TIRES. AND THEY'RE USING THEM IN LIVESTOCK FEEDING AREAS, THEY'RE USING THEM IN -- THERE WAS A PROJECT AT THE SALTON SEA THAT THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT USING BALED TIRES TO HELP HAVE THE WATER RUN AROUND IT TO DO SOME PURIFICATION.

I'VE GOT A PROBLEM WITH ELIMINATING THE USE

OF BALED TIRES IN THE LANDFILL -- OR, TO ADDING COST TO IT

JUST TO MAKE IT COMPETITIVE WITH SOME OTHER END USES THAT

HAVE HIGHER COSTS. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE END RESULT IS. IF

THE RESULT IS TO KEEP THEM FROM POPPING UP, BALED TIRES

DON'T POP UP IN LANDFILLS.

MEMBER ROBERTI: ISN'T ONE OF THE PROBLEMS --

```
CHAIRMAN EATON: SENATOR ROBERTI?
             MEMBER ROBERTI: I MEAN, IT'S HARD TO GET AN
   ANSWER ON HOW LONG IT TAKES A TIRE TO BIODEGRADE --
             MEMBER JONES: THEY DON'T.
             MEMBER ROBERTI: -- BUT -- WELL, I DO THINK AFTER
   A PERIOD OF TIME -- I MEAN --
              (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)
             MEMBER ROBERTI: -- A THOUSAND YEARS, I DON'T
   KNOW, 5,000 YEARS --
10
              (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)
11
             MEMBER ROBERTI: -- A BALED TIRE NEVER, EVER
   WILL. WHEREAS, A TIRE CHIP -- AND I'M JUST THINKING OUT
12
   LOUD -- I THINK THERE IS SOME POINT IN TIME WHERE THERE IS
13
14
   SOME DEGRADABILITY. I DON'T KNOW HOW LONG, I DON'T KNOW HOW
15
   MANY YEARS. BUT, IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE PLANET EARTH,
   YOU KNOW, A BALED TIRE IS, YOU KNOW, LITERALLY FOREVER, WE
16
17
   MIGHT AS WELL BURY --
             CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT. DO YOU WANT TO GO
18
19
   THROUGH ANY OF THE OTHERS? OR --
20
             MR. FITZGERALD: THERE WAS A QUESTION ASKED ON WHY
21
2.2
             CHAIRMAN EATON: -- ARE THERE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS
23
24
              (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)
```

MR. FITZGERALD: -- THAT CHANGE WAS MADE ON --CHAIRMAN EATON: -- COME BACK TO --MR. FITZGERALD: -- THE GRANULATED RUBBER. AND GRANULATED RUBBER IS A TERM THAT VIRTUALLY NO ONE USES EXCEPT WHEN -- IN OUR REGULATIONS. AND SO THE RECOMMENDATION WAS TO CHANGE IT TO CRUMB RUBBER, WHICH IS A MORE UNIVERSAL TERM. AND THE QUESTION THIS MORNING CAME UP, I BELIEVE ONE OF THE AUDIENCE CAME FORWARD AND SUGGESTED THAT 10 CRUMB RUBBER SHOULD INCREASE ONE -- TO INCLUDE ONE-INCH 11 CUBES AS WELL, AND SEVERAL OTHER THINGS. 12 THE ONE-QUARTER INCH IS PRETTY MUCH THE 13 STANDARD THAT -- DEFINITION FOR CRUMB RUBBER, GRANULES OF 14 ONE-QUARTER INCH OR SMALLER. 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: THERE'S NOTHING IN STATUTE --16 MR. FITZGERALD: NO. 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- THAT REFERS TO GRANULATED, 18 RIGHT? SO, WE'RE NOT RUNNING AFOUL OF THAT. MR. FITZGERALD: NO, NOT THAT I'M AWARE OF. 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. MR. JONES. 20 21 MEMBER JONES: WE ALWAYS HEAR THAT THERE IS A BIG 2.2 DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CRUMB RUBBER AND RUBBER SHAVINGS, OR 23 WHATEVER BOB WINTERS DOES --24 MR. FITZGERALD: RUBBER BUFFINGS?

MEMBER JONES: BUFFINGS. ARE THEY CONSIDERED THE SAME IN OUR DEFINITIONS, OR WHAT? ARE WE CONSIDERING CRUMB MR. FITZGERALD: COULD BE --MEMBER JONES: -- AND BUFFINGS TO BE THE SAME? MR. FITZGERALD: YES. YES, BECAUSE THEY --MEMBER JONES: DO WE NEED TO INCLUDE THAT? MR. FITZGERALD: -- WOULD BE SMALLER THAN ONE-QUARTER-INCH SIZE, SO THEY WOULD BE CRUMB. MEMBER JONES: OKAY. 10 MR. FITZGERALD: IT'S JUST THE SOURCE WHERE THEY 11 COME FROM, WHETHER THEY COME FROM BUFFINGS OR OTHER 12 PROCESSES. 13 MEMBER JONES: OKAY. 14 MR. FITZGERALD: SO THAT CONCLUDES --15 MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, MR. CHAIRMAN --CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON. 16 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I KNOW WE SORT OF HAVE A PROBLEM HERE WITH MY SUGGESTION TO TAKE THE ALTERED WASTE 18 TIRES, INCLUDING BALED TIRES OUT. HOWEVER, I THINK THAT 19 20 FITZ, AS WE HAVE SAID IN THE PAST, HAS DONE AN EXCELLENT 21 JOB. I DON'T HAVE ANY PROBLEM OTHER THAN THAT ONE, SO, 2.2 THEREFORE, I WOULD MOVE THE ADOPTION OF THE TIRE REPORT. 23 I DON'T KNOW, IS THERE A --24 CHAIRMAN EATON: THERE IS ONE INDIVIDUAL, AT LEAST ___

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

2.2

23

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OH, OKAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- AT THE CURRENT TIME, THAT

WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK ON THE ISSUE. SO --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY.

CHAIRMAN EATON: PERHAPS WE CAN HEAR FROM MR. ED
COHN, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TIRE DEALERS, AND THEN CAN
ENTERTAIN A MOTION.

MR. COHN: MY NAME IS ED COHN, I'M THE EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TIRE DEALERS AND
RETREADERS ASSOCIATION.

I WOULD LIKE TO THANK THE BOARD FOR LETTING
US PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROGRAM. I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO THANK
FITZ FOR ALL THE GOOD STUFF HE DID. I DON'T THINK THE
REPORT IS PERFECT YET, BUT HE DID A HELL OF A JOB, AND I
THINK YOU VERY MUCH FOR LETTING US BE PART OF THE PROCESS.
THANK YOU.

18 CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU. OKAY.

19 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, THEN I'LL GO

AHEAD AND MAKE MY MOTION?

CHAIRMAN EATON: PLEASE.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: ARE YOU READY?

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES, SIR. THANK YOU.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL MOVE ADOPTION OF THE TIRE

REPORT, WITH THE DELETION OF THE TERM "ALTERED WASTE TIRES,"
INCLUDE "BALED TIRES."

CHAIRMAN EATON: JUST SORT OF TO GET SOME

CLARIFICATION, THE CURRENT BOARD POLICY IS TO -- THE

SENTENCE THAT MR. PENNINGTON REFERS TO, IS THAT CURRENT

BOARD POLICY, OR --

MR. FITZGERALD: CURRENT BOARD POLICY DOES
CONSIDER A BALED TIRE AS AN ALTERED TIRE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. AND SO -- IT'S NEVER TOO

LATE. I ALWAYS WAITED. THAT'S WHY I WAITED, MR. WHITE, YOU

KNOW THAT. YOU AND MR. LARSON HAVE WORKED THIS ROOM ENOUGH,

YOU KNOW YOU WAIT TILL THE END OF TIME. I MEAN, IT'S NICE.

OKAY. SO THAT'S CURRENT BOARD POLICY.

MR. FITZGERALD: THAT IS CORRECT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. WHAT WE'D BE DOING -- AND YOU'RE ASKING THAT CURRENT BOARD POLICY CHANGE. AND I'M JUST TRYING TO GET IT CLARIFIED --

(THE MEMBERS CONFER SIDE BAR.)

MEMBER ROBERTI: TO GET IT BEFORE (INAUDIBLE) I'LL SECOND THE MOTION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION BY MR.

PENNINGTON TO ADOPT THE REPORT AND THE PROPOSED CHANGES -
MEMBER PENNINGTON: CORRECT, WITH THE PROPOSED

24 CHANGES.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- WITH THE DELETION IN THE DEFINITION OF ALTERED WASTE TIRE, THE SENTENCE THAT SAYS:

"ALTERED WASTE TIRES INCLUDED BALED TIRE BUT DO NOT INCLUDE CRUMB RUBBER." THAT'S THE MOTION THAT'S BEEN SECONDED BY SENATOR ROBERTI.

MADAM SECRETARY, PLEASE CALL -- OOPS, BEFORE
WE DO THAT -- I'M SORRY -- MR. WHITE WAS HERE TO SPEAK. AND
I'M SORRY. I'M SORRY.

MR. WHITE: CHARLES WHITE WITH THE WASTE

MANAGEMENT, AND I DID WANT TO SPEAK ON THIS ALTERED TIRE

ISSUE.

IT HAS BEEN A LONG-STANDING POLICY OF THIS
BOARD, AND FROM THE STAFF, THEY WOULD CONSIDER BALED TIRES
TO BE PART OF THE DEFINITION OF ALTERED TIRES. IF YOU WERE
TO MAKE THAT CHANGE IT WOULD BE A SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE.

AND I THINK MR. JONES DID ADD -- DID SPEAK TO
THIS ISSUE, AND QUITE ACCURATELY, IT WOULD -- COULD
CONCEIVABLY INCREASE THE COST OF MANAGING TIRES, BECAUSE YOU
WOULD BASICALLY EXCLUDE THAT POSSIBILITY OF USING BALED
TIRES IN LANDFILLS.

AND NOT THAT WE WOULDN'T ENCOURAGE HIGHER AND
BETTER USES FOR TIRES. BUT, IF YOU ARE IN THE PROCESS OF
REMEDIATING A TIRE PILE -- LIKE WAS AT WINDBERRY FOR
EXAMPLE, THAT WERE ALREADY BALED, THAT THE CHEAPEST OPTION

FOR THE BOARD IN THAT CASE WAS TO TAKE THOSE TIRES IN AND HAVE THEM PLACED INTO A LANDFILL, WHICH IS A SAFE AND SECURE OPTION -- THE STAFF HAS PREVIOUSLY LOOKED AT THIS AND DOES -- HAS BELIEVED IN THE PAST THAT BALED TIRES DO MEET THE DEFINITION OF ALTERED TIRE FOR SAFE AND SECURE DISPOSAL.

SO, WE WOULD ENCOURAGE THE BOARD TO CONTINUE THAT OPTION UNDER THIS REPORT AND INTO THE FUTURE. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES -MEMBER PENNINGTON: ISN'T IT TRUE -CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M SORRY.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: ISN'T IT TRUE THOUGH, CHUCK,
THAT IF, IN THE CASE OF WINDBERRY, THAT THOSE TIRES WOULD
HAVE ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED EITHER A WASTE TIRE OR A
DISPOSABLE TIRE?

2.2

THE BALING ONLY WAS SECONDARY TO IT. BUT THERE'S NOTHING IN THIS THAT SAYS IT COULDN'T BE BURIED BALED. I JUST OBJECT TO CALLING THEM THAT.

MR. WHITE: WELL, BUT THE PROBLEM IS, THEY COULD
- AND THIS IS AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THEY COULD NOT BE PUT IN

THE LANDFILL AS A BALED TIRE UNLESS IT IS CONSIDERED TO BE

PART OF THE DEFINITION OF APPLICANT. YOU CAN PUT ALTERED

TIRES INTO LANDFILLS, LIKE CHIPPED OR SLICED, OR WHATEVER

MATERIAL, AND IN LARGE PART TO PREVENT THEM FROM FLOWING TO

THE SURFACE.

2.2

ONCE PUT IN THE LANDFILL THE BALING REMAINS

INTACT AND DOES -- IT WON'T BREAK APART. AND STAFF HAS

LOOKED AT THAT -- THIS ISSUE, AND DOES BELIEVE, AT LEAST IN

MY OPINION, IT IS BELIEVED THAT IT IS A SAFE AND SECURE

METHOD OF MANAGING THESE TIRES, AND DOES PROVIDE A LOW-COST

OPTION FOR MANAGING TIRES IN A LANDFILL ENVIRONMENT.

AND, IF HIGHER AND BETTER USES CAN BE FOUND,
FINE. BUT, IF YOU'RE GOING TO -- IF THE OPTION IS OF
REMEDIATING A TIRE, AND RATHER THAN HAVE THEM BE DISPERSED
INTO THE ENVIRONMENT IN AN UNCONTROLLED OR ILLEGAL FASHION,
AT LEAST YOU HAVE THE OPTION OF TRYING TO SECURELY PLACES
THESE TIRES INTO A LANDFILL WHERE THEY WON'T POSE A THREAT
TO HUMAN HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT. SO -- AS A BALED TIRE,
AS WE WOULD URGE THE BOARD TO CONTINUE THAT POLICY.

OR, IF YOU'RE GOING TO REVISIT THAT ISSUE, WE WOULD URGE YOU TO HAVE A MORE FULL DISCUSSION OF THAT.

BECAUSE, I THINK THERE ARE SUBSTANTIAL CONSEQUENCES AND COSTS FOR REMEDIATING TIRE PILES, THAT YOU'D BE ELIMINATING THAT OPTION. AND FROM A TECHNICAL STANDPOINT, YOU KNOW, WE BELIEVE THAT AN ALTERED TIRE SHOULD INCLUDE THE DEFINITION OF A BALED TIRE TO BE ABLE TO PRESERVE THAT OPTION IF THE BOARD -- OR, SOME OTHER REMEDIATION OPTION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: IS -- I'M SORRY. SENATOR

ROBERTI?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER ROBERTI: I JUST WANTED TO THROW OUT ONE
MORE OPTION. WHILE I SECONDED THE MOTION AND AM FOR IT, IS
THAT IN MY EXPERIENCE AND IN VARIOUS DISCUSSIONS I'VE HAD,
THE NUMBER OF USES FOR A TRULY ALTERED TIRE ARE EXTENSIVE,
THE NUMBER OF USES FOR A WHOLE TIRE ARE PRETTY LIMITED.
AND, EXCEPT YOU CAN PUT THEM IN LANDFILLS AND MAYBE A COUPLE
OF OTHER AGRICULTURAL USES. AND, I THINK THAT USE ASPECT
HAS TO BE AN ASPECT OF WHAT -- THE DECISION THAT WE MAKE
HERE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: SO, IF I CAN --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WHAT HAPPENS --

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON? I'M SORRY.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT'S OKAY. WHAT HAPPENS IF YOU INADVERTENTLY GET A FIRE IN THE LANDFILL TO THAT BALED TIRES?

MR. WHITE: WELL, WE'RE NOT AWARE OF ANY SITUATION WHERE THERE HAS BEEN BALED TIRE LEAD TO A LANDFILL FIRE.

AND YOU BASICALLY ARE COVERING THEM, SECURING THEM, KEEPING THE OXYGEN, KEEPING THEM IN A MONOFILL-TYPE OPERATION. THEY ARE USUALLY MONOFILLED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WOULD NOT POSE A FIRE THREAT WHATSOEVER.

AS I -- AGAIN, I UNDERSTAND THE STAFF OF THIS BOARD HAS LOOKED AT THIS AND HAS CONCLUDED THAT THEY --

BALED TIRES CAN BE SAFELY AND SECURELY --

MEMBER ROBERTI: I THOUGHT THERE WAS ONLY ONE TIRE MONOFIL IN CALIFORNIA.

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT.

MR. WHITE: WELL, THERE ARE -- IS ONE THAT'S

OPERATING IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. WE OPERATE THE AZUSA

LANDFILL. THEN ALSO THE CALIFORNIA ASBESTOS MONOFIL, WHICH

OPERATES INTERMITTENTLY TO TAKE IN TIRES IF --

MEMBER ROBERTI: THAT IS --

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MR. WHITE: -- AS NECESSARY, WHICH WE ALSO DO

12 OPERATE.

10

15

16

17

21

2.2

13 MEMBER ROBERTI: -- AS A TIRE MONOFILL?

MR. WHITE: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

MEMBER ROBERTI: AND THAT'S BETWEEN -- OKAY. AS

BETWEEN THOSE TWO MONOFILLS, WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TIRES IN

THE STATE DO THEY TAKE IN --

18 MR. WHITE: NO, I COULDN'T TELL YOU OFF THE TOP OF

19 MY HEAD --

20 MEMBER ROBERTI: -- THEY GET LANDFILL --

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MR. WHITE: -- I HONESTLY DON'T KNOW.

23 MEMBER ROBERTI: I HAVE A HUNCH IT'S NOT ALL OF

24 THEM.

MR. WHITE: I'M SURE IT'S NOT ALL OF THEM, NO. MEMBER ROBERTI: THAT'S WHAT I'M SAYING. THAT'S -MR. WHITE: I CAN VERIFY THAT, FOR SURE. MEMBER ROBERTI: -- WHAT I'M SAYING. SO, I THINK THE HAZARD MR. PENNINGTON SPEAKS OF US A POTENTIAL, IF NOT ACTUAL. MR. WHITE: WELL, WE WOULD CERTAINLY SUPPORT THE IDEA OF BALING BEING AN ALTERED TIRE IF IT'S PLACED IN A 10 MONOFIL OPERATION. THAT'S -- THAT WOULD BE FINE, TOO, IF 11 YOU WANTED TO LIMIT IT TO THAT. 12 BUT, WE BELIEVE THIS -- YOU'RE GOING TO 13 SUBSTANTIALLY LIMIT YOUR OPTIONS FOR LOW-COST ALTERNATIVES 14 TO MANAGE TIRES --15 MEMBER ROBERTI: WELL, I JUST -- I WANT TO --(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) 16

MEMBER ROBERTI: -- INJECT ON THAT POINT, TOO,

JUST TO STRESS IT. AND THAT IS, I THINK WE SHOULD BE

ENCOURAGING ALTERNATIVES USES FOR WASTE TIRES, AND A TRULY

ALTERED TIRE DOES HAVE A NUMBER OF USES. AS I INDICATED

EARLIER THIS MORNING, I SAW US WORKING ON LEVEE CONSTRUCTION

WITH THE USE OF TWO-INCH CHIPS.

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

AND I KIND OF THINK WE THROW OUR HANDS UP IN THE AIR AND SAY NOTHING CAN BE DONE, WHEN WE START BURYING

LIKE 11 MILLION TIRES IN THE AZUSA MONOFIL, I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY IN THE ASBESTOS MONOFIL THAT YOU SPEAK OF.

SO, I JUST THINK THE TIME HAS COME FOR US TO THINK OF CREATIVE USES FOR USED TIRES. AND THIS DEFINITION SORT OF SAYS WE'RE DEFEATED BEFORE WE ENTER THE FRAY.

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER JONES: ONE OF THE FIXES THAT WE WERE GOING
TO DO AT THE INYO COUNTY LANDFILL WAS TO GO IN THERE AND
BALE TIRES, AND USE THEM TO SUPPORT WHAT WAS AN ERODING
FOUNDATION FOR THE SLIDE SLOPES. THERE WAS A REAL
METHODOLOGY BEHIND BALING THOSE TIRES AND USING THEM, AND
THEY COULD BE USED EFFECTIVELY.

ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE COMMISSION AT THIS
BOARD -- BECAUSE, THERE HAVE BEEN -- AND I'M NOT PROPOSING
THAT WE DON'T GO THIS WAY. BUT, WE SPENT MONEY WITH DANA
HUMPHREYS, AND WITH OTHERS, TO TRY TO COME UP WITH MONOFIL
REGS TO DEAL WITH WHAT HAS BEEN AN OCCURRING (SIC) PROBLEM.
AND THAT IS TIRE SHREDS IGNITING IN MONOFILS. THEY
GENERATE HEAT, THEY CATCH ON FIRE. THOSE ARE TIRE SHREDS
THAT HAVE PIECES OF METAL.

THEY THINK -- I MEAN, THE ROADS THAT CALTRANS ALWAYS REFERS TO IN WASHINGTON THAT CAUGHT ON FIRE THAT WERE BUILT ON 30-FEET DEEP OF TIRE SHREDS AND 20-FEET DEEP HAD TO

DO WITH THE SIZE OF THE -- SIZE OF THE SHRED AND THE FACT
THAT THERE WAS ORGANIC MATERIAL THAT IT CAME IN CONTACT
WITH, AND THEY GENERATED THEIR OWN HEAT AND IGNITED. THAT'S
AN ONGOING ISSUE THAT WE'RE TRYING TO DEAL WITH ON
MONOFILLING OF SHREDDED TIRES.

I'M NOT SAYING THAT IT'S BAD. BUT, BEFORE WE LET CAM (PHONETIC) GET PERMITTED FOR MONOFIL THAT WOULD ONLY TAKE SHREDDED TIRES, WE MADE THEM -- AND OUR STAFF WORK WITH THEM -- TO FIND OUT WHAT THE -- WE DIDN'T WANT TO PUT OUT A SET OF REGS THAT WERE GOING TO END UP IN A FIRE AND AN INDUSTRIAL -- AND ANOTHER ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM. SO, WE'VE BEEN WORKING WITH DR. HUMPHREYS AND OTHERS TO TRY TO COME UP WITH WHAT'S THE APPROPRIATE WAY TO BUILD A MONOFIL BUILT OF SHREDS, EVEN THOUGH THE LAW SAYS THAT'S HOW ALL TIRES ARE SUPPOSED TO BE DONE.

2.2

WE'RE -- AS FAR AS I KNOW WE'RE STILL WORKING ON THAT. I KNOW THAT CAM (PHON) SPENT A LOT OF MONEY TO TRY TO COME UP WITH -- AND HELP US ON THE MONITORING OF SHREDDED TIRES AND THE MONOFIL. BUT, I DON'T THINK WE'VE GOT THE ANSWERS YET OF HOW THAT STUFF'S GOT TO BE PLACED, WHAT THE LIFTS HAVE TO BE, HOW MUCH DIRT HAS TO BE IN BETWEEN THEM AS WE CONSTRUCT THAT.

BUT MY PROBLEM IS, IF WE DON'T -- IF WE JUST

24 SAY THAT YOU CAN'T BALE -- YOU CAN'T DISPOSE OF A BALED TIRE

AFTER IT'S BEEN COMPRESSED AND 140 TIRES ARE IN THIS CUBE,
THEN I THINK ALL WE'VE DONE IS PLAY INTO THE HANDS OF
DRIVING THOSE COSTS UP TO ACTUALLY DISPOSE OF IT SOMEWHERE
ELSE, NOT NECESSARILY USE IT FOR A POSITIVE END USE, AND
JUST DRIVE THE COSTS UP.

AND I'LL SPEND ALL THE TIME IN THE WORLD TALKING ABOUT THIS THING WITH EVERYBODY ON THIS BOARD IF WE'VE GOT, YOU KNOW, THE DATA TO SUPPORT IT. BUT I CAN'T SUPPORT THIS MOTION IF WE'RE TAKING BALED TIRES OUT AND WE LEAVE THAT AS AN OPTION NOT TO -- NOT TO DISPOSE OF THEM, BECAUSE I THINK WE'RE JUST ARTIFICIALLY DRIVING THE COSTS UP.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: LET ME SEE IF I CAN'T SORT OF MAYBE FIND SOME COMMON GROUND.

CURRENTLY BALED TIRES -- AND NOT TO BEAT A

DEAD HORSE -- IS CURRENT BOARD POLICY. IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. FITZGERALD: THAT'S CORRECT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THIS REPORT WOULD NOT INDICATE A SHIFT IN THAT BOARD POLICY.

MR. FITZGERALD: THAT'S CORRECT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: BECAUSE, OBVIOUSLY IT'S A REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE, BUT IT THEN HAS TO GO FOR EITHER LEGISLATIVE ACTION OR OTHERWISE.

COULD WE PERHAPS REACH SOME COMMON GROUND BY

SUGGESTING THAT -- BECAUSE I THINK MR. WHITE, I THINK,

RAISED THE ISSUE THAT THIS MAY -- IT RUNS CONTRARY TO BOARD

POLICY, AND OBVIOUSLY WOULDN'T WANT TO GIVE THE INDICATION

THAT THE REPORT SOMEHOW CHANGES THAT POLICY WITHOUT A FULL

PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON THE CHANGE OF THAT POLICY, WHICH IS NOT

WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE.

THAT, ONE, IF WE COULD JUST PERHAPS DELETE THE SENTENCE, PER MR. PENNINGTON -- HOWEVER, WITH THE ADDED CAVEAT THAT WE WOULD BRING BACK A DISCUSSION AS IT RELATES TO THE POLICY, BECAUSE THAT IS THE EVENTUAL ISSUE HERE -- AND THEN AT THAT TIME DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT WE WANT TO SEND A CLARIFICATION LETTER TO THE APPROPRIATE BODIES THAT WE SEND THE REPORT TO FOR -- WITH NOT ONLY A DETERMINATION THAT IT WOULD CHANGE OR REMAIN THE SAME, OR THAT THE POLICY WOULD CHANGE....

I'M JUST TRYING TO FIND A WAY THAT WE COULD

GET THE REPORT MOVING, BUT YET AT THE SAME TIME PROTECT THE

POLICY ASPECTS THAT WE CURRENTLY LABOR UNDER, AND AT THE

SAME TIME ACCOMMODATE CHANGES.

BECAUSE, OBVIOUSLY WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE
ISN'T THE POLICY AS ADOPTED, IT IS A REPORT THAT WE'RE
RECOMMENDING THERETO. I BELIEVE THAT TO BE THE CASE.
ALTHOUGH SOME HAVE TAKEN IT AS LAW ALREADY, WHICH SCARES ME

TO SOME EXTENT. BUT, I'M JUST TRYING TO REACH A WAY THAT WE CAN KIND OF MOVE THE REPORT ALONG. BUT I LEAVE THAT AS AN AVENUE, NOT THE ONLY AVENUE.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: IF I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SUGGESTING, IT CERTAINLY IS PROBABLY OKAY WITH ME, BUT LET ME JUST MAKE SURE.

YOU'RE SAYING TO GO AHEAD AS I -- AS MY

MOTION -- PUT IT FORWARD, TAKE THAT OUT, BUT BRING THAT

BACK, SAY, WHEN WE BRING BACK THE REGS AND HAVE A FULL

DISCUSSION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD KEEP IT IN OR OUT

AT THAT POINT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: WELL, IT WOULD BE A COMMITMENT TO MR. JONES AND TO MR. WHITE, AND TO OTHERS, WHO HAVE RAISED -

MEMBER PENNINGTON: ALL RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- THE WHOLE ISSUE, THAT THE

REPORT WOULD GO -- WITH YOUR AMENDMENT, WHICH WOULD TAKE OUT

THE DELETION FOR THE TIME BEING -- IT WOULD BE SILENT, IN

ESSENCE, AS IT WAS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED.

BUT, THAT AS A COMMITMENT TO BOARD MEMBER

JONES, WE WOULD THEN COME BACK AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME -
AND I DON'T HAVE ANY TIME FRAME THAT WOULD BE THERE. BUT

I'M JUST TRYING TO --

MEMBER ROBERTI: IF I COULD JUST INTERJECT?

CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE. SENATOR ROBERTI. MEMBER ROBERTI: I DON'T SEE ANYTHING WRONG WITH MR. PENNINGTON'S MOTION AS IT STANDS RIGHT NOW. IF IT PASSES, IT PASSES; IF IT FAILS, IT FAILS. YOU KNOW, ALL OF US HAVE BEEN ON THE WINNING --CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE. MEMBER ROBERTI: -- OR LOSING SIDES OF VOTES. WITHOUT TAKING ANYTHING PERSONAL, I MEAN, YOU KNOW, THAT'S -10 CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE, NO. 11 MEMBER ROBERTI: -- LIKE THE BUNKER (PHONETIC). 12 BUT WE WERE -- WE'D BE MAKING A POLICY 13 STATEMENT, AND THEN -- I MEAN, I -- SHOULD THIS MOTION FAIL 14 -- I HAVE NO INTENTION OF VOTING AGAINST THE TIRE REPORT. 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: CORRECT. BUT HE INCLUDED IT AS PART OF THE OVERALL REPORT. 16 17 MEMBER ROBERTI: WELL, YEAH. THEN HE'S PROBABLY NOT --18 19 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- SO WHAT WE --21 MEMBER ROBERTI: -- NOT MAKING IT A MOTION --(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- SEPARATE THE ISSUES. 24 MEMBER ROBERTI: -- ASSUMING THAT'S GOING TO FAIL,

SINCE I DON'T SENSE OVERWHELMING ENTHUSIASM, AT LEAST FROM MR. JONES --

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MEMBER ROBERTI: -- AT LEAST ONE.

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT.

MEMBER ROBERTI: AND THEN WE VOTE AGAIN ON A TRUNCATED MOTION.

BUT, IF WE'RE COMING BACK ON THE REGS, I JUST DON'T THINK IT'S BEFORE US. IF IT'S NOT IN THE MOTION AND IT'S NOT IN THE REPORT, THEN THE BUSINESS OF THE DEFINITION REALLY -- AT LEAST REGARDING ALTERED TIRES, REALLY ISN'T BEFORE US. IT MAY BE ANOTHER AGENDA ITEM WHICH WE MAY WANT AT THE SAME TIME, BUT IT'S NOT BEFORE US AS PART OF THE TIRE REPORT.

I WOULD LIKE IT BEFORE US AS PART OF THE TIRE REPORT, A VOTE ON THAT AS PART OF WHAT I CONCEIVE AS A MAJOR REFORM. BECAUSE, FRANKLY, IF THE ISSUE IS CHANGING A POLICY OF THE BOARD, THAT'S WHAT THE TIRE REPORT IS DOING, IN A WHOLE HOST OF AREAS. SO, WHY NOT CHANGE IT IN THIS AREA TOO. IF IT'S SUCCESSFUL, TERRIFIC.

IF IT'S NOT SUCCESSFUL, WELL, THAT'S AMERICA,
YOU KNOW, AND I'LL STILL SPEAK TO YOU AND MR. JONES AND
WHOMEVER ELSE, WHOM I -- I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU'RE VOTING, MR.
CHAIRMAN, BUT THAT DOESN'T BOTHER ME.

CHAIRMAN EATON: YOU'RE NOT THE ONLY ONE. I HAVEN'T MADE UP MY MIND YET, I'M TRYING TO SORT OF --MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH. CHAIRMAN EATON: -- SEE IF THERE'S A WAY THAT --MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH, I --CHAIRMAN EATON: -- BUT I UNDERSTAND THAT AS JUST SORT OF COLLEGIALITY. BUT, THERE'S BEEN A MOTION AND THERE'S A SECOND, AND SO I GUESS WE CAN JUST CALL THE ROLL. 10 MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH. 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: MADAM SECRETARY, PLEASE CALL THE 12 ROLL. THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES? 13 14 MEMBER JONES: NO. 15 THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON? MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. 16 17 THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI? MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE. 18 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON? 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE. 20 21 ALL RIGHT. THE MOTION --2.2 MEMBER JONES: QUESTION. CHAIRMAN EATON: -- FAILS. 23 24 MEMBER JONES: QUESTION. THE ONLY WAY THAT A

BALED TIRE CAN BE LANDFILLED IS BECAUSE IT IS ALTERED.

MR. CHANDLER: AS I UNDERSTAND IT, WE HAVE
REQUIREMENTS THAT SAY YOU CANNOT LANDFILL WHOLE TIRES. AND
WE NOW SAY THAT YOU CAN LANDFILL WHOLE TIRES IF THEY'RE
BALED. AND THAT WAS DUE TO A BOARD RESOLUTION BACK IN -- AN
ADOPTED POLICY BACK IN 1992.

DID I MISSTATE THAT, FITZ?

MR. FITZGERALD: YOU'RE ESSENTIALLY CORRECT.

STATUTE STATES THAT A TIRE MUST BE ALTERED IN ORDER TO BE LANDFILLED.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY.

MR. FITZGERALD: AND THEN, BY DEFINITION, THE BOARD IN THEIR RESOLUTION DEFINED A BALED TIRE AS AN ALTERED TIRE, WHICH DID ALLOW IT TO BE LANDFILLED.

MEMBER JONES: ALL RIGHT. YOU KNOW, I FIND IT

INTERESTING THAT -- I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH WHERE MY

FELLOW BOARD MEMBERS ARE COMING FROM, BUT WE HAVE -- WE ARE

LOOKING AT SOME HUGE TIRE CLEANUPS IN THE STATE OF

CALIFORNIA.

ESPECIALLY IF THIS -- IF THIS REPORT GOES

THROUGH AND GIVES US THE MONEY TO CLEANUP 15 MILLION TIRES

IN TWO YEARS, AND BY EFFECTIVELY -- BY TAKING OUT ALTERED

TIRES FOR BALING, WE'RE TAKING OUT ONE WHOLE SEGMENT OF WHAT

CAN BE A REMEDIATION FACILITY TO US, AND SAYING WE'RE STILL

GOING TO DISPOSE OF THEM, BUT WE'RE GOING TO DO IT IF YOU CHOP THEM, SHRED THEM, OR BURN THEM. BUT IF YOU BALE THEM AND TAKE THEM TO A MONOFIL IN THIS NEXT TWO-YEAR PERIOD WE'RE NOT GOING TO DO THAT.

SO, YOU'VE TAKEN ONE SEGMENT OF POTENTIAL REMEDIATORS OUT OF THE EQUATION, AND AT THE SAME TIME POSSIBLY DRIVEN OUR COSTS UP.

I KNOW THAT THERE WAS SOME CONCERN IN PART OF

-- IN A COUNTY SOUTH OF US THAT, WHILE THERE WERE OPTIONS

AVAILABLE ON SITE, OR WHATEVER, THE RUMORS WERE THAT WE MAY

GO IN THERE AT A CHEAPER COST AND REMEDIATE THE POTENTIALLY

BIGGEST TIRE DISASTER THAT COULD HAPPEN BY BALING THEM AND

HAULING THEM AWAY. I HAD NEVER HEARD THAT, BUT I HEARD IT

COMING FROM PEOPLE, THAT THAT WAS A POTENTIAL REMEDIATION

FOR ONE OF THE BIGGEST TIRE PILES IN THE STATE.

2.2

AND IT -- IT STRUCK ME AS INTERESTING THAT WE WANT TO ELIMINATE THAT WHEN WE'RE READY TO CLEAN UP EVERY TIRE IN THE STATE -- TWO YEARS. SO, I DON'T KNOW WHAT MOTIVATES -- WHAT MOTIVATED SOME OF THE LETTERS TO US. I KNOW WHAT MOTIVATES THIS BOARD, AND IT'S ALL THE RIGHT STUFF, I UNDERSTAND THAT COMPLETELY.

THE TIMING OF TAKING THAT OUT NOW AND NOT -AND WHEN WE'RE GOING TO TRY TO CLEAN UP EVERY TIRE IN TWO
YEARS, I THINK TIES OUR HANDS. MAYBE IT IS APPROPRIATE TO

DEAL WITH IT AS PART OF THE REPORT FOR -- YOU KNOW, FOR TWO AND THREE YEARS OUT, THAT THAT CAN'T -- YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T DO THAT.

BUT, I THINK IF WE'RE SUCCESSFUL AND THIS

TIRE REPORT GOES THROUGH, AND WE HAVE TO CLEANUP 15 MILLION

TIRES, OF LEGACY TIRES, THAT ARE -- THAT DON'T HAVE -- SOME

OF THEM DON'T HAVE A BENEFICIARY USE -- THEN WE NEED EVERY

OPTION, EVERY -- WE NEED TO MINIMIZE THOSE EXPENSES AS MUCH

AS WE CAN TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM SO WE CAN BUILD THE

MARKETS FOR THE FLOW (PHONETIC) TIRES.

AND I DON'T WANT TO SEE THIS OPTION -- I -- BELIEVE ME, I RESPECT MY COLLEAGUES COMPLETELY AND KNOW WHAT THEY'RE AFTER, AND I AGREE WITH WHAT YOU ARE AFTER. I WOULD LIKE SOME CONSIDERATION AS TO WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN IN THE NEXT TWO YEARS, AND NOT TAKE AWAY WHAT COULD BE A VIABLE REMEDIATION TOOL FOR US AS WE TRY TO ATTACK 15 MILLION TIRES.

CHAIRMAN EATON: SENATOR ROBERTI.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

MEMBER ROBERTI: YEAH. MEMBER JONES MAKES, AS
USUAL, A INFORMED ARGUMENT BASED ON AN AWFUL LOT OF
EXPERIENCE IN THIS AREA. THE FACT THAT I DON'T AGREE WITH
IT DOESN'T MEAN IT'S NOT AN INFORMED ARGUMENT.

23 CHAIRMAN EATON: WHERE IS THAT GLAZING OVER THAT 24 WE NEED --

MEMBER ROBERTI: BUT -- BUT --

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- FROM TIME TO TIME BEFORE

LUNCH?

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MEMBER JONES: I CAN NEVER GET HIM, I'LL TELL YOU.

MEMBER ROBERTI: BUT -- NO -- BUT -- BUT, WHAT'S -

_

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)

MEMBER ROBERTI: -- ELEMENTARY ON THIS BOARD IS,

WE HAVE A HIERARCHY, AND THE BOTTOM OF THE HIERARCHY IS

LANDFILL. AND I THINK WE CONTRAMAND WHAT WE'RE SUPPOSED TO

BE DOING WHEN, IN THE VERY DEFINITIONS WE OPERATE UNDER,

SEEM TO BE GIVING A PRIORITY TO LANDFILLING.

AND, SO THAT DOESN'T MEAN THERE'S NOT MERIT
TO WHAT YOU SPEAK OF, BECAUSE THERE IS. AND THIS IS A CLOSE
QUESTION, IT'S NOT ONE WITH -- THAT'S ABSOLUTE ON ONE SIDE
OR THE OTHER. BUT, WE'RE ALWAYS TALKING ABOUT RETURNING TO
THE HIERARCHY. WHICH IS, YOU KNOW, I GUESS THE GUIDING LAW
THAT WE OPERATE UNDER HERE. AND, BOY, I THINK THAT WE'RE
DEFEATING THAT CONCEPT WHEN IN OUR DEFINITIONS WE MAKE IT
IMPOSSIBLE FOR US TO RETURN TO THE HIERARCHY.

SO, HAVING SAID THAT, I GUESS WE NEED ANOTHER MOTION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: TRUNCATED AS IT MAY BE --

(THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT. WELL, I'M --MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'LL -- I MOVE RESOLUTION 1999-283, TO APPROVE THE FINAL REPORT AS REQUIRED UNDER AB 117 AS IT STANDS. MR. FITZGERALD: WITH THE PROPOSED CHANGES? MEMBER JONES: WITH THESE PROPOSED CHANGES. MR. FITZGERALD: OKAY. MEMBER JONES: OKAY. 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: DO I HAVE A SECOND? 11 MEMBER ROBERTI: I'LL SECOND. 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES MOVES AND MISTER --SENATOR ROBERTI SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT RESOLUTION -- I'M 13 14 SORRY, WE ADOPT THE FINAL --15 (MR. JONES AND CHAIRMAN EATON CONFER.) CHAIRMAN EATON: -- THAT WE ADOPT 16 17 1999-283, WITH PROPOSED CHANGES. MADAM SECRETARY, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL. 18 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES? 19 20 MEMBER JONES: YES. 21 THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON? 2.2 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. 23 THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI? 24 MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON? CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE. OKAY. MEMBER JONES: GOOD JOB, FITZ. WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT: CHAIRMAN EATON: GENTLEMEN, IF YOU REMEMBER, ITEM NO. 13 WAS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR THIS MORNING. // // AGENDA ITEM 14(B): CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF AWARD 10 OF INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 11 AT RIVERSIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENERIC GUIDANCE, 12 EDUCATIONAL, AND TRAINING MATERIALS FOR THE LANDSCAPE 13 MANAGEMENT OUTREACH PROGRAM 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: WE'LL MOVE TO ITEM NO. 14. ΤF 15 YOU CAN REMEMBER, 14 (A) WAS PART OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR, 14(B) REMAINS TO BE VOTED UPON. 16 17 MS. TRGOVCICH: GOOD AFTERNOON CHAIRMAN EATON AND 18 MEMBERS, I'M CAREN TRGOVCICH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE WASTE 19 PREVENTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT DIVISION. 20 ITEM NO. 14(B) IS THE AWARD OF THE 21 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT 2.2 RIVERSIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENERIC GUIDANCE, 23 EDUCATIONAL, AND TRAINING MATERIALS FOR THE LANDSCAPE

MANAGEMENT OUTREACH PROGRAM. YOU APPROVED THE SCOPE OF WORK

24

FOR THIS AGREEMENT ON CONSENT THIS MORNING; THIS IS THE ACTUAL AWARD TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT RIVERSIDE. THE STAFF WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS OF MS. TRGOVCICH? HEARING NONE? OKAY. MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES. MEMBER JONES: WE'VE GOT TWO RESOLUTIONS, WHICH 10 ONE TAKES CARE OF THE MONEY? 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: (B), (B) --12 MEMBER JONES: -- 243? 13 MS. TRGOVCICH: 243. 14 MEMBER JONES: OKAY. 15 MS. TRGOVCICH: RESOLUTION 1999-243. MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D LIKE TO MOVE 16 17 ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 1999-243. CHAIRMAN EATON: AND I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION. 18 SO, MR. JONES MOVES AND MR. EATON SECONDS 19 20 THAT RESOLUTION 1999-243 BE ADOPTED. 21 IF THERE ARE NO OBJECTIONS, WE'LL SUBSTITUTE 2.2 THE PREVIOUS ROLL CALL? 23 HEARING NO OBJECTIONS, SO SHALL BE ORDERED. 24 AGENDA ITEM 15(B): CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF AWARD

OF CONTRACT FOR THE 2000 GRASSCYCLING PUBLIC EDUCATION

CAMPAIGN TO THE BUREAU OF SANITATION FOR THE CITY OF LOS

ANGELES

CHAIRMAN EATON: THE NEXT ITEM.

MS. TRGOVCICH: ITEM NO. 15(B), CHAIRMAN EATON AND MEMBERS, IS CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR THE 200 GRASSCYCLING PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN TO THE BUREAU OF SANITATION FOR THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES.

ONCE AGAIN, THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR THIS

CAMPAIGN WAS ON CONSENT THIS MORNING. THIS ITEM IS FOR THE

AWARD OF THE CONTRACT TO THE BUREAU OF SANITATION FOR THE

CITY OF L.A., AND THAT HAPPENS TO BE RESOLUTION NO. 1999
245.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES, MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: I WILL MOVE RESOLUTION 1999-245.

AND, ALSO WOULD LIKE TO SAY THIS IS AN ONGOING PROJECT FOR THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS, TRYING TO ATTACK PART OF THE WASTE STREAM. AND I'M VERY ENCOURAGED THAT STAFF HAS FOUND SOURCES OTHER THAN OIL MONEY TO DEAL WITH THE POLLUTION ISSUES, AND WE CAN DEAL WITH THE GRASSCYCLING ISSUE.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL SECOND THE MOTION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHTY. MR. JONES MOVES AND MR. PENNINGTON SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT THE RESOLUTION 1999-245.

WITHOUT OBJECTION, WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PREVIOUS ROLL CALL. HEARING NO OBJECTION, SO SHALL BE ORDERED.

AGENDA ITEM 16: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE

REVISED RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

CHAIRMAN EATON: THE NEXT ITEM.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. TRGOVCICH: ITEM NO. 16, MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, IS CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA. WE HAVE A BRIEF PRESENTATION FOR YOU THIS AFTERNOON, AND IT WILL BE PRESENTED BY JOHN BLUE OF THE DIVISION STAFF.

I'D LIKE TO JUST PROVIDE A VERY BRIEF

INTRODUCTION BY LETTING YOU KNOW THAT EACH YEAR THE BOARD

HEARS A ITEM APPROXIMATELY IN LATE SPRING/EARLY SUMMER TO

CONSIDER THE TYPES OF PROJECTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE

BROUGHT FORWARD TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER THE BOARD'S REVOLVING

LOAN PROGRAM.

THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IS VERY IMPORTANT
BECAUSE, AS ANY APPLICANT KNOWS, POTENTIAL BORROWER KNOWS,

THAT THEY HAVE MANY AVENUES OR OPTIONS SOMETIMES TO PURSUE FINANCIAL RESOURCES, AND AT OTHER TIMES THEY MAY HAVE VERY LIMITED OPTIONS DEPENDING UPON THEIR FINANCIAL STRENGTH.

BUT, IN EITHER CASE, THEY WANT

TO KNOW AHEAD OF TIME, BEFORE FILING AN APPLICATION FEE AND

CONSENTING TO PAY FOR SUBSEQUENT ACCOUNTING WORK, AND OTHER

APPROPRIATE-RELATED WORK, WHETHER OR NOT THEY FIT THE

PICTURE OF THE TYPE OF PROJECTS THAT THIS BOARD IS

INTERESTED IN HAVING BROUGHT FORWARD UNDER THE LOAN PROGRAM.

SO, THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ARE USED ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS

BY OUR LOAN OFFICERS AND BY OUR RMDZ ADMINISTRATORS IN THE

FIELD. AND IT IS WHAT THE APPLICANTS SEE AS TO WHETHER OR

NOT THEY MEET THE TYPE OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION THAT THIS

BOARD IS INTERESTED IN.

2.2

SO, WITH THAT, I WILL TURN IT OVER TO JOHN
BLUE. HE WILL DESCRIBE BRIEFLY FOR YOU THE ELIGIBILITY
CRITERIAS THEY ARE WITH RESPECT TO THE CHANGES WE ARE
PROPOSING.

AND, WE DO HAVE A DISCUSSION ITEM FOR YOU WHERE WE ARE SOLICITING YOUR DIRECTION, YOUR INPUT, ON SOME POTENTIAL NEW CHANGES OR OPENING UP OF THE CRITERIA INTO NEW AREAS.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. BLUE.

24 MR. BLUE: THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON MR.

CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS.

THE REGULATIONS GOVERNING, AS CAREN MENTIONED EARLIER, THE RMDZ REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM ALLOWED THE BOARD TO ESTABLISH LENDING PRIORITIES AND THE PROJECT ELIGIBILITY, OR WHERE THE BOARD ESTABLISHES THE TYPE OF PROJECTS THEY WISH TO FINANCE.

THE BOARD LAST ADOPTED ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA IN JULY OF '97. AND THE CHANGES HERE -- THE BULK OF THEM ARE LARGELY EDITORIAL, AND THEY'RE ATTACHMENT 2 IN YOUR ITEM.

MORE SIGNIFICANTLY, WE'VE ADDED EXAMPLES OF ELIGIBLE INFRASTRUCTURE AND ADC PROJECTS, AND WE'VE INCLUDED A \$2 MILLION SET-ASIDE FOR THE BUY RECYCLING 1998 PROGRAM.

ADDITIONALLY IN THE ITEM, THE STAFF IS

PROPOSING TO ALLOW THE USE OF RMDZ FUNDS FOR DECONSTRUCTION

AS AN INFRASTRUCTURAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.

THE SHEET I JUST PASSED OUT INCLUDES SOME

ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE FOR THE EXAMPLE OF AN ELIGIBLE

DECONSTRUCTION PROJECT THAT STAFF WOULD LIKE CONSIDERED WITH

THE ITEM. THIS WOULD ALLOW LOCAL GMS TO USE LOAN FUNDS FOR

DECONSTRUCTING MILITARY BASES PRIOR TO TRANSFER TO PRIVATE

PARTIES, AS WELL AS OTHER STRUCTURES. ADDITIONAL COPIES OF

THE CHANGES OF THE ITEM CAN BE FOUND IN THE BACK OF THE ROOM

IF ANYONE IS LOOKING FOR THEM.

ADDITIONALLY, STAFF IS PROPOSING THAT THE BOARD REQUIRE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOANS TO INCLUDE SOME BUY-RECYCLED CRITERION. ON THE ITEM ON PAGE 16-4 OF THE PACKET, STAFF PROVIDES A LIST OF THREE OPTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER. THESE OPTIONS RANGE FROM THE MOST STRINGENT TO THE LEAST STRINGENT.

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD SELECT ONE OF THE OPTIONS FROM THE SPECIFIC LIMITATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS SECTION, AND ADOPT THE PROPOSED 1999 RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM PROJECT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA CONTAINED IN ATTACHMENT 2 USING THE ALTERNATIVE DECONSTRUCTION LANGUAGE PROVIDED.

THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. I'D BE HAPPY
TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAVE AT THIS TIME.

MS. TRGOVCICH: CHAIRMAN EATON --

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. TRGOVCICH: -- AND MEMBERS, WE KEPT THIS

PRESENTATION SHORT BECAUSE WE ANTICIPATE SOME DISCUSSION IN

THE AREAS THAT WE OUTLINED FOR YOU. WE ARE ESPECIALLY

INTERESTED IN YOUR THOUGHTS REGARDING LOCAL GOVERNMENT

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.

THE STATUTE ALLOWS THE MONIES, THE REGULATION ALLOWS THE MONIES TO BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE, BUT THE BOARD HAS NOT, IN PREVIOUS ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, LOOKED AT THE

SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROJECTS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE COMING FORWARD.

NEXT MONTH YOU WILL SEE THE FIRST LOAN COMING FORWARD FROM A LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND IT IS BEING BROUGHT FORWARD UNDER THE EXISTING ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

BUT, THERE ARE OTHER OPTIONS. AND, AS WE KNOW FROM OUR WORK CURRENTLY WITH THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO AROUND THE MATHER FIELD PROJECT, AND MANY OF THE OTHER CITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT JURISDICTIONS THAT WE'RE WORKING WITH, THERE ARE SOME OPPORTUNITIES.

THE STATUTE DOES LIMIT OUR ABILITY IN SOME

AREAS TO PROVIDE FUNDS, BUT WE WOULD CERTAINLY LIKE TO HAVE

A DISCUSSION AROUND THAT AS WELL.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST A QUESTION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

MEMBER JONES: IN MY BRIEFING WE GOT IN A

DISCUSSION ABOUT -- ON THE TRANSFORMATION ISSUES, WHERE

WE'RE TALKING ABOUT GETTING AG WASTE AND PULLING OUT

(INDISCERNIBLE) FOR METHANOL (PHONETIC) OR ETHANOL, AND

THOSE TYPES OF PRODUCTS -- WHERE WE CAN -- WE CAN DERIVE A

FUEL SOURCE BUT WE REALLY DON'T DO MUCH TO BREAK THAT

MATERIAL DOWN. IT'S -- THE VOLUMES DON'T -- WE DON'T AFFECT

THE VOLUME OF MATERIAL THAT WILL ULTIMATELY BE -- GO TO A

LANDFILL, EVEN THOUGH WE ARE EXTRACTING SOMETHING POSITIVE

(PHONETIC).

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

WHICH I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH. I MEAN,

IT'S -- I THINK THOSE TYPES OF PROJECTS ARE GOOD. BUT, I'D

LIKE US TO THINK ABOUT THE AREAS OF HYDROGEN, WHICH IS A

FUEL CELL (PHONETIC) -- I MEAN, A PRODUCT THAT CAN BE USED

IN A FUEL CELL.

AND THERE IS A LOT OF WORK GOING ON DOWN IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, ESPECIALLY DOWN AT -- OH, THE ONE OVER THERE BY BURBANK AIRPORT -- ANYWAY --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: YOU MEAN THE JET PROPULSION LAB?

MEMBER JONES: WELL, YOU KNOW, THE ONE RIGHT

ACROSS -- THAT'S DOING THE ALTERNATIVE FUELS?

14 ANYWAY, THERE'S A LOT OF WORK

BEING -- A LOT OF WORK THAT THEY'RE IN THE -- HUH?

(UNIDENTIFIED PARTIES CONFER OFF-MIKE.)

MEMBER JONES: I CANNOT THINK OF THE NAME, I'LL
THINK OF IT IN ABOUT TWO MINUTES, I'VE GOT OLD-TIMER'S
DISEASE.

MEMBER ROBERTI: A SENIOR MOMENT.

MEMBER JONES: A SENIOR MOMENT.

BUT, I THINK THAT IF WE LOOK AT SOME OF THE PYROLYSIS THAT IS GOING ON THAT'S PUTTING HYDROGEN OUT, THEY'RE LOOKING AT LANDFILLS AS SOURCES, THEY'RE ALSO LOOK

AT WASTE STREAMS AS SOURCES, IT'S NOT TRANSFORMATION.

BUT, IN HAVING SOME DISCUSSIONS WITH PAUL
RELLIS (PHON) AND OTHERS, PAUL IS -- PAUL AND I HAVE TALKED
QUITE A BIT ABOUT THAT THIS MAY BE ANOTHER PIECE. YOU KNOW,
ABOUT TRYING TO EXTRACT THOSE TYPE OF FUELS AND AFFECT
(PHON) THAT WASTE STREAM.

I DON'T NECESSARILY WANT TO PROMOTE IT, BUT I DON'T WANT TO PRECLUDE US FROM BEING ABLE TO TALK ABOUT IT.

YOU KNOW, I MEAN, IF WE HAVE IT IN HERE AS SOMETHING THAT WE CAN LOOK AT MAYBE WE CAN OPEN UP A WHOLE 'NOTHER AVENUE IN GETTING US OUTSIDE THE BOX AND LOOKING AT SOME OTHER TECHNOLOGIES FOR SOLID WASTE HANDLING THAT MAY HAVE SOME REAL BENEFITS.

2.2

MS. TRGOVCICH: I THINK WE HAVE SEEN A GREAT DEAL OF INTEREST, ESPECIALLY RECENTLY, IN THE ALTERNATIVE TYPE FUELS.

WE RECENTLY HAD A MEETING DOWNTOWN WHERE THE NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY CAME OUT AND PRESENTED SOME OF THE PROJECTS THAT THEY ARE CURRENTLY WORKING ON.

AND, I BELIEVE THERE ARE THREE MAJOR PROJECTS THAT ARE MOVING IN, INTO THIS STATE AT SOME LEVEL, BE IT AN R&D OR COMMERCIALIZATION PHASE.

I WILL SAY THAT WHAT WE DID HERE

IS, MAY OF THESE PROJECTS ARE ON THE ORDER OF \$50- TO \$70-

MILLION PROJECTS. BUT, REGARDLESS, WE DO SEE A ROLE THAT WE COULD POTENTIALLY PLAY ALONG WITH OTHER AGENCIES THAT MAY HAVE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE-TYPE PROGRAMS.

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT. THEY COULD GO TO FEDERAL ENERGY TO GET THE BULK OF THAT MONEY. RIGHT?

MS. TRGOVCICH: THERE ARE PROGRAMS WHERE FUNDING IS MADE AVAILABLE, IT DEPENDS UPON WHO THEY'RE PARTNERING WITH, IT DEPENDS UPON WHERE IT'S LOCATED, THERE ARE A VARIETY OF FACTORS.

MEMBER JONES: SO WE MAY BE ABLE TO JUST FILL A PIECE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: CORRECT.

MR. BLUE: MAY I ASK A CLARIFYING QUESTION?

WERE YOU LOOKING FOR SOME LANGUAGE TO -- LIKE

BROADENING THIS, TO ALLOW HYDROGEN PRODUCTION FROM AG OR

16 GREEN WASTE?

17 MEMBER JONES: ACTUALLY, I THINK BROADER THAN THAT

18 --

10

11

12

13

14

15

MR. BLUE: OR, HOW ABOUT -

20 MEMBER JONES: -- SO THAT WE DON'T LIMIT OURSELVES

21 TO --

24

MS. TRGOVCICH: WHAT ABOUT IF UNDER ELIGIBLE --

23 AND I DON'T EVEN KNOW THAT --

MR. BLUE: I HAVE SOME LANGUAGE, I CAN PROPOSE

SOME LANGUAGE HERE. DO YOU HAVE --MEMBER JONES: BUT IT CAN'T JUST BE GREEN WASTE. MR. BLUE: NO, I KNOW. MEMBER JONES: OKAY. MR. BLUE: WELL, IN THIS INSTANCE I WAS THINKING PRODUCTION OF FUELS, OR FUEL PRODUCTION FROM AGRICULTURAL OR GREEN WASTE, AND ALSO CROP RESIDUE OR GREEN WASTE. MS. TRGOVCICH: ALTERNATIVE FUELS --MEMBER JONES: I'D LIKE TO CHANGE THAT ALTERNATIVE 10 FUELS FROM THE --11 MR. BLUE: OKAY. 12 MEMBER JONES: -- MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE STREAM. MR. BLUE: OKAY. WELL, THAT WOULD -- SO INCLUDE -13 14 15 (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.) MR. BLUE: -- MUNICIPAL WASTE AND AGRICULTURAL 16 17 CROP RESIDUE? 18 MEMBER JONES: YEAH. I'M TRYING TO BROADEN IT --19 MR. BLUE: OKAY. 20 MEMBER JONES: -- THE BASE FROM JUST NOT 21 AGRICULTURAL --2.2 MR. BLUE: RIGHT. 23 MEMBER JONES: -- BUT TO THAT WHOLE SPECTRUM --24 MR. BLUE: YEAH.

MEMBER JONES: -- OF SOLID WASTE.

BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THEY WERE TALKING TO US

ABOUT, WAS THAT THERE WAS -- THERE WERE ENERGY SOURCES, EVEN

AT CLOSED LANDFILLS, TO BE ABLE TO PULL THAT MATERIAL OUT.

WHICH IS COMPRISED OF A LOT MORE THAN JUST THE ORGANICS.

SO.

MS. TRGOVCICH: CORRECT. SO IF -- SO THAT NEW LINE UNDER ELIGIBLE, ARE WE ON PAGE 16-15 OF THE PACKET?

AND UNDER ELIGIBLE IT WOULD SAY: "PRODUCTION OF ALTERNATIVE FUELS FROM THE MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE STREAM AND/OR AGRICULTURAL CROP RESIDUES"?

MEMBER JONES: IF THAT WOULD - IF THAT'S WHAT THE REST OF THE BOARD MEMBERS WOULD -- I MEAN, THAT WOULD WORK FOR ME, AS A -- I THINK THAT'S BROAD ENOUGH.

AND IT'S ONLY A CONSIDERATION --

CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT.

MEMBER JONES: -- I MEAN, JUST TO GIVE US A LITTLE MORE ROOM TO LOOK AT PROJECTS.

CHAIRMAN EATON: WHAT WAS THE LANGUAGE AGAIN?

MS. TRGOVCICH: THE LANGUAGE AGAIN -- AND IT WOULD

BE AT THE TOP OF PAGE 16-15, "TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS,"

UNDER ELIGIBLE.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

CHAIRMAN EATON: UM-HUM.

24 MS. TRGOVCICH: THE THIRD BULLET WOULD BE CHANGED

TO READ: "PRODUCTION OF ALTERNATIVE FUELS FROM THE MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE STREAM AND/OR AGRICULTURAL CROP RESIDUES."

MEMBER JONES: AND THAT WOULD BE ITEM FOUR.

RIGHT?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. TRGOVCICH: I WOULD --

MEMBER JONES: WHICH WOULD STILL LEAVE THREE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: I THINK THAT THIS COULD SUBSTITUTE

FOR THERE, IT WOULD BE BROAD ENOUGH.

MALE VOICE: THAT'S WHAT I WAS THINKING.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY, THAT'S FINE, THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY? FINE.

THE ISSUE, WITH REGARD TO SOME DIRECTION, IS REGARDING PERHAPS SOME SUSTAINABILITY, AS IT RELATES TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS, I BELIEVE ON PAGE 16-16, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, OPTIONS ONE, TWO AND THREE, WHERE WE HAVE THE OPTION TO JUST USE KIND OF ENCOURAGEMENT LANGUAGE OF, YOU KNOW, WHERE FEASIBLE A 15% SORT OF THRESHOLD AND A 50% THRESHOLD.

AND I THINK JUST FROM MY STANDPOINT, IS THAT EVEN THOUGH THIS STATES AT 50%, LOCAL JURISDICTIONS MAY OR MAY NOT YET HAVE THE EXPERTISE TO DO SOME OF THOSE PROJECTS.

BUT I THINK WE'VE ALSO KIND OF GOT TO BE IN THE PROCESS, SO I WOULD LIKE TO SELECT OPTION TWO, WHICH IS 15%, WHICH KIND

OF GIVES THEM AT LEAST AN INITIAL STEP OR TWO WITHOUT REALLY SORT OF, YOU KNOW, HAMMERING THEM, AND ALSO NOT LETTING THEM COMPLETELY OFF THERE, AND SEE IF WE CAN'T GET SOME REALLY GOOD PROJECTS THAT WE CAN THEN SHOW OTHERS AND SAY, SEE, IT REALLY CAN BE. SO THAT WOULD BE THE ONE I WOULD PREFER.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I WOULD AGREE WITH YOU, MR.

CHAIRMAN. BUT I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO ADD TO THAT SOMETHING

ALONG THE LINES THAT SAYS WHENEVER POSSIBLE RECYCLED

MATERIALS TO BE USED SHOULD BE MANUFACTURED IN CALIFORNIA,

OR FROM CALIFORNIA WASTE. THERE'S NO NEED FOR US TO BE

TAKING SOMEBODY ELSE'S STUFF.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: SO, IN OTHER WORDS, WE WOULD SAY

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, IF YOU USE RECYCLED -CHAIRMAN EATON: YEAH, I'M JUST --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- PLASTIC LUMBER --

CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT, I'M JUST --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- IF THERE'S A MANUFACTURER HERE IN CALIFORNIA THEY SHOULD BE GIVEN MORE CONSIDERATION THAN AN ILLINOIS MANUFACTURER, FOR EXAMPLE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: AND THAT CERTAINLY FITS WITH -- CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT.

MS. TRGOVCICH: -- THE DIRECTION WE'VE TAKEN ON PROJECTS SUCH AS THE EAST END PROJECT AND OTHERS, WHERE

WE'VE BEEN LOOKING AT LIFE CYCLE COSTS, AND WE'VE BEEN LOOKING AT THE TRANSPORTATION ISSUE AS WELL.

SO THAT WOULD BE ADDED TO OPTION TWO.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: CORRECT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: CORRECT. SO NOT ONLY BUY RECYCLED BUT BUY CALIFORNIA RECYCLED. OKAY.

ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS OR OPTIONS?
DISCUSSION?

MS. TRGOVCICH: WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION WITH RESPECT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFRASTRUCTURE FOCUS ON DECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES?

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. LET ME GET THERE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: AND THE KEY ISSUES FOR THAT --

CHAIRMAN EATON: WHICH NUMBER?

MS. TRGOVCICH: THAT'S DISCUSSED ON PAGE 16-4.

16 AND JOHN --

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

21

22

17 CHAIRMAN EATON: DIDN'T WE JUST TAKE CARE OF THAT

WITH -- MAYBE I'M MISTAKEN --

MS. TRGOVCICH: 16-14.

20 MEMBER JONES: YEAH.

MS. TRGOVCICH: INFRASTRUCTURE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

PROJECTS. OH, MAYBE -- YEAH, YOU SELECTED THE OPTION, AND

23 THEN THIS WOULD FEED BACK IN.

24 CHAIRMAN EATON: CORRECT. BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT I

WAS TRYING TO FIND. I WENT TO, FIRST, 16-4, BUT THEN YOU WERE WORKING OFF THE ACTUAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

MS. TRGOVCICH: THE OPTION LANGUAGE. CORRECT.

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: WE'RE CONSISTENT THERE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: YES.

MEMBER JONES: JUST A QUESTION OF EITHER YOU OR CAREN. WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT 15% RECYCLED CONTENT, WHEN WE'RE LOOKING AT A PROJECT LIKE THAT, IF THEY HAVE A LOT OF MATERIAL IN THAT PROJECT THAT IS 50, 50 OR 70% RECYCLED CONTENT, AND A LOT OF OTHERS THAT MIGHT BE, YOU KNOW, ZERO OR 5% OR WHATEVER, WE'RE LOOKING AT AN AVERAGE.

WE'RE NOT SAYING THAT THE MATERIAL NEEDS TO BE 15%, RIGHT? WE'RE LOOKING AT THIS AS OVERALL, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, WE WANT TO ACHIEVE 15% FOR THE PROJECT. IS THAT WHAT I'M UNDERSTANDING?

MS. TRGOVCICH: CORRECT.

MR. BLUE: YES.

CHAIRMAN EATON: FOR THE PROJECT.

MS. TRGOVCICH: IT'S NOT BY PRODUCT, IT IS

21 OVERALL.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.2

23

24

MEMBER JONES: RIGHT. SO IT'S GOING TO BE A GIVE
AND TAKE TYPE -- BECAUSE I DON'T WANT TO LIMIT US HERE,

BECAUSE THERE'S SOME THINGS THAT WE CAN GET THAT ARE 100% --

MR. BLUE: RIGHT.

MEMBER JONES: -- AND OTHERS THAT HAVE VERY, YOU KNOW, MINIMAL AMOUNTS. AND I THOUGHT I UNDERSTOOD IT TO MEAN THAT, I JUST WANTED TO GET CLARIFICATION BECAUSE I NEED THAT SOMETIMES.

CHAIRMAN EATON: HARDLY NEVER EVER WOULD -
MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, WE CERTAINLY DON'T WANT

THEM TO TEAR OUT TO GET DOWN TO 15%.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. I HAVE MR. EVAN EDGAR WHO WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON....

MR. EDGAR: CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS, MY NAME IS EVAN EDGAR, EDGAR ASSOCIATES, ON BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA REFUSE REMOVAL COUNCIL.

WHAT WE HAVE HERE TODAY IS A 1999 POLICY THAT KIND OF OPENS UP SOME OLD ISSUES, AND I TAKE A NEW OUTLOOK ON IT. WHAT I'D LIKE TO REVIEW IS PAGE THREE, 16-3 I BELIEVE, LET ME FIND IT -- NO, 16-13, REGARDING TYPES OF PROJECTS. UNDER ADC, ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER, IT STATES THAT RMDZ PROGRAMS, ADC WOULD BE A TYPE OF PROJECT ELIGIBLE FOR RMDZ PROGRAMS.

WHAT I HAVE FOR THE LAST YEAR IS A POSITION
PAPER ABOUT ADC ABUSE IN CALIFORNIA, AND THIS IS SOMETHING
THAT'S BEEN GOING ONGOING AND IT'S BEING RAMPANT THROUGHOUT
CALIFORNIA USING GREEN WASTE.

I BELIEVE THAT ANY LANDFILL OR PROJECT USING OVER 10% OF ADC GREEN WASTE TO SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SHOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR RMDZ PROGRAM LOANS IN ORDER TO ABUSE ADC. THIS IS AN ISSUE I BROUGHT UP OVER A YEAR AGO, I'D LIKE TO CONTINUE ON THE DISCUSSION, AND MAYBE HOLD A WORKSHOP ABOUT ADC ABUSE IN ORDER TO HIGHLIGHT MY CONCERNS. THERE'S A COALITION WITHIN THE INDUSTRY WITH CAW, CRA, AS WELL AS CRC THAT'D LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT THIS ISSUE EVEN FURTHER.

BUT IN TODAY'S DISCUSSION ON THE 1999 POLICY
FOR RMDZ LOANS I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT SOME TYPE OF LIMITATION
OF ADC PROJECTS WHERE ADC ABUSE IS RAMPANT. THAT'S MY FIRST
ISSUE.

2.2

THE SECOND ISSUE I HAVE IS UNDER RECYCLING PROJECTS, WHAT IS ELIGIBLE. ONE THING THAT IS MISSING IS TITLE 14 COMPLIANCE. I'VE BEEN IN FRONT OF THIS BOARD ON MANY DIFFERENT TITLE 14 ISSUES WITH REGARDS TO CROKER (PHON) AND C&D WASTE, OR RIVER HAWK AND DOS AMIGOS RANCH ON MULCHING PROJECTS. AND ONE THING THAT I -- WE USED TO HAVE IN THE POLICY BACK IN 1993-94 WAS THAT ANY RECYCLING PROJECT WHERE THEY NEEDED A -- SOME TYPE OF PROCESSING PERMIT THAT NEEDED TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 14.

IF THAT COULD BE ADDED BACK INTO THE ELIGIBLE PROJECT LIST, THAT WOULD BE APPRECIATED, BECAUSE IN THE PAST

I BELIEVE THAT SOME OF THE LOANS HAVE GONE TO SOME FACILITIES THAT MAY NOT BE IN COMPLIANCE.

A THIRD THING I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT IS THAT
IT DOES SAY UNDER INELIGIBLE PROJECTS THAT LAND APPLICATION
OR RECLAIMED PROJECTS USING MULCH AND/OR COMPOST OTHER THAN
FOR ADC. JUST TWO MONTHS AGO I BELIEVE DOS AMIGOS RANCH
DOES NOT MAKE COMPOST, THEY MAKE MULCH, AND THEY APPLY IT.
ACCORDING TO THIS LIST HERE THEY WOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR
ANY TYPE OF RMDZ LOANS, BUT YET THEY WERE GRANTED ONE.

SO THERE'S SOME OLD HISTORY I HAVE BROUGHT UP OVER THE PAST, AND TODAY'S 1999 POLICY COULD ADD SOME CLARIFYING NOTES ABOUT ADC AND LAND APPLICATION OF MULCH AND TITLE 14 COMPLIANCE. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN EATON: CAN I GET A BIT OF CLARIFICATION?

YOU USED THE WORD "RAMPANT ABUSE" --

MR. EDGAR: CORRECT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: -- OF ADC. YET IN THE SHEET YOU HANDED US IT TALKS ABOUT IT BEING ABUSED IN A FEW MARKET ZONES IN CALIFORNIA. WILL THE REAL EVAN EDGAR PLEASE STAND UP?

MR. EDGAR: HE'S HERE. THE HANDOUT I -
CHAIRMAN EATON: I MEAN, BECAUSE WE'VE HAD THE

DISCUSSION BEFORE AND IT IS A CONCERN, BUT YOU SAID THAT

THERE WERE SOME ISOLATED -- SO IS THERE SOMETHING IN

ADDITION NOW THAT WE DON'T KNOW? AND THAT'S WHAT I'M JUST TRYING TO GET AT. I WAS BEING SOMEWHAT FACETIOUS. BUT, I MEAN, IN ESSENCE IS THERE SOMETHING THAT'S THERE NOW SINCE YOUR LAST REPORT?

MR. EDGAR: CORRECT. WHAT YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU IS A HANDOUT I JUST HAPPENED TO HAVE ON ME FROM THE BIOCYCLE CONFERENCE I PUT OUT, SO IT'S DATED -- I BELIEVE IT'S DATED MARCH, 1999.

CHAIRMAN EATON: RIGHT.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. EDGAR: SINCE THAT TIME THE 1998 NUMBERS HAVE CAME IN. IF YOU LOOK AT MY ANALYSIS THERE, IT'S BASED UPON 1997 INFORMATION. AND AS OF RECENT, I DO NOT HAVE THE 1998 BOE NUMBERS AND 1998 ADC NUMBERS. LOOKING AT THOSE NUMBERS IT HASN'T ATTENUATED, IT'S GOTTEN WORSE IN THE SAME MARKET ZONES AND IN NEW MARKET ZONES.

SO MY INITIAL ANALYSIS ON THE 1998 NUMBERS,
THAT IS WORSE, IT'S MORE RAMPANT, AND THAT'S WHY I'D LIKE TO
BRING BACK TO THE BOARD IN THE FUTURE IS, ONCE I GET DONE
WITH MY ANALYSIS ON 1998, IN COALITION WITH THE CALIFORNIA
ORGANIC RECYCLING COUNCIL, CAW, AND CRA, IS BRING THE
INFORMATION BACK TO HIGHLIGHT THAT RAMPANT ABUSE OF ADC IN
MANY MARKET ZONES IN CALIFORNIA.

MS. TRGOVCICH: CHAIRMAN EATON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES.

MS. TRGOVCICH: WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO PROVIDE SOME RESPONSE TO THE THREE ISSUES THAT MR. EDGAR RAISED?

CHAIRMAN EATON: PLEASE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: WITH RESPECT TO -- AND I'D LIKE TO TAKE THE ADC AND TITLE 14 COMPLIANCE ISSUE, I THINK THERE WOULD BE VALUE IN TAKING THEM TOGETHER.

THESE ARE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, SO THIS IS
FOR PURPOSES OF THE APPLICANTS TO SEE DOES MY PROJECT MEET
THE NEEDS OF THE BOARD, MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATE
IN TERMS OF THE TYPES OF PROJECTS THEY WANT TO SEE COMING
FORWARD.

2.2

THE REGULATIONS, AS WELL AS THE LOAN

DOCUMENTS, THE CLOSING DOCUMENTS, THE COVENANTS REGARDING

THE LOAN ITSELF, SPECIFY THAT EACH AND EVERY PROJECT MUST BE
IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

AND THIS ISSUE HAS COME UP WITH RESPECT TO A NUMBER OF LOANS IN THE PAST. AND YOU'LL REMEMBER THAT WE HAVE -- WE SEND INSPECTORS OUT TO THESE SITES TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE REPORTS TO THE BOARD IN ADVANCE OF BOARD CONSIDERATION OF ANY LOAN APPLICATION WHERE STATE SOLID WASTE REGULATION GOVERNS THOSE OPERATIONS. THEY ARE ALSO REQUIRED TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH ANY OTHER LOCAL OR FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

SO THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT WE TAKE CARE

OF, AND IT IS IN REGULATION. IT IS NOT IN THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA BECAUSE THIS IS JUST A PROJECT DOCUMENT.

SO, WITH RESPECT TO ADC, GOING BACKWARDS JUST A LITTLE BIT, WHATEVER OTHER REQUIREMENTS THE BOARD SET FORTH, WHATEVER THE APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS ON THE USE OF ADC THAT THE BOARD HAS IN ITS OTHER PROGRAMS WOULD GOVERN ANY USE OF FUNDS UNDER THE LOAN PROGRAM FOR THOSE TYPE OF PROJECTS.

AND, TO MY KNOWLEDGE, AND I CAN JUST STATE

FROM MY THREE YEARS IN THIS PROGRAM, I HAVE NOT SEEN A LOAN

COME FORWARD FOR THE USE OF ADC, AND I DO NOT KNOW -- AND I

CANNOT SAY FOR CERTAIN WHETHER THERE'S BEEN ANY LOAN -
EVERYONE'S SHAKING THEIR HEADS NO. SO, I DON'T BELIEVE

THERE HAS EVER BEEN A LOAN WHERE IT HAS BEEN AN ADC-RELATED

LOAN.

THIS ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA HAS BEEN IN THE DOCUMENT FOR AS LONG -- FOR MANY YEARS NOW. IT MAY BE SOMETHING YOU WANT TO TAKE OUT BECAUSE OF LACK OF USE, OR APPROPRIATENESS.

WITH RESPECT TO THE MULCH ISSUE THAT EVAN

RAISED, I'D JUST LIKE TO POINT YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE 16-14

--

MEMBER ROBERTI: IF I COULD JUST INTERJECT, BASED ON WHAT MS. TRGOVCICH IS SAYING? AND THAT IS, I DON'T SEE

HOW FOR PURPOSES OF DIVERSION RATES WE CAN CHANGE THE FACT
THAT WE USE ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER AS A FACTOR. BUT, I
THINK THIS BOARD WOULD BE REMISS IF WE DO ANYTHING BEYOND
THAT AND START ENCOURAGING ITS USE AS AN ASPECT OF
DIVERSION.

THERE'S A DIFFERENCE IN ALLOWING IT AND ENCOURAGING IT. AND THE FACT THAT WE ALLOW IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE IT, BECAUSE, FRANKLY, IT'S A FICTION AND EVERYBODY KNOWS IT'S A FICTION, BUT IT'S A FICTION WHICH WE ALLOWED AND WE JUST CANNOT ALLOW MUNICIPALITIES TO -- WE CANNOT NOW FORCE UPON MUNICIPALITIES SOMETHING WHICH WE SHOULD HAVE REALIZED MAYBE A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO.

2.2

SO, AS FAR AS MY OWN PERSONAL VOTE AROUND
HERE IS CONCERNED, I'M NOT GOING TO DO ANYTHING TO ENCOURAGE
ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER AS ANYTHING OTHER THAN A FICTION.
BUT IT'S A FICTION WE'VE LEARNED TO LIVE WITH,
UNFORTUNATELY, AND WE CAN'T IMPOSE IT UPON MUNICIPALITIES AT
THIS LATE DATE, TO MAKE THAT CHANGE.

MS. TRGOVCICH: WITH RESPECT TO THE MULCH COMMENT,
ON PAGE 16-14, YOU CAN SEE UNDER RECYCLING PROJECTS THERE'S
AN ELIGIBLE HEADING AND AN INELIGIBLE HEADING. UNDER
ELIGIBLE THE THIRD BULLET IS "PRODUCING MULCH OR COMPOST."
UNDER INELIGIBLE, THE FOURTH BULLET IS "LAND APPLICATION OR

RECLAMATION PROJECTS."

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

THE ELIGIBLE ITEM IS INTENDED TO FOCUS ON OPERATIONS SUCH AS DOS AMIGOS, WHERE THEY ARE IN THE PRODUCTION OPERATION. THAT'S WHAT THEY ARE DOING, THEY ARE PRODUCING THE MATERIAL.

THE FOURTH BULLET UNDER INELIGIBLE IS REALLY FOCUSED ON REMEDIATION PROJECTS, WHERE IT'S THE ACTUAL APPLICATION, SO THE LOAN FUNDS ARE GOING FOR THE ACTUAL PLACEMENT OF THAT MATERIAL AS A REMEDIATION PROJECT.

MEMBER JONES: BUT ISN'T THAT -- MR. CHAIRMAN?

ISN'T THAT A LITTLE BIT OF A -- ON THE ONE THAT YOU'RE

TALKING ABOUT, THESE ARE TRIMMINGS FROM HIS FIELDS THAT HE

GRINDS UP AND PUTS DOWN ON HIS LAND.

MS. TRGOVCICH: BUT THE LOAN WAS FOR EQUIPMENT
THAT WOULD BE USED TO TAKE IN WASTE FROM THE URBAN WASTE
STREAM, AND IT WAS TO PROCESS THAT MATERIAL INTO MULCH. IT
WAS NOT TO RECLAIM THE LAND. NONE OF THE LOAN FUNDS WERE
USED WITH RESPECT TO THE PLACEMENT OF THE PRODUCT. THE LOAN
FUNDS WERE USED TO INCREASE HIS CAPACITY TO PROCESS, TO
PRODUCE THE MULCH COMING FROM THE URBAN WASTE STREAM.

MEMBER JONES: AND THE MULCH IS GOING TO GO ON HIS LAND.

MS. TRGOVCICH: BUT THE DISTINCTION -- THE ONLY DISTINCTION I'M DRAWING HERE, IN TERMS OF WHAT'S INELIGIBLE,

IS WE'VE HAD APPLICANTS COME IN BEFORE WHERE THEY'RE THE LANDOWNER, AND WHAT THEY WANT IS A LOAN TO BRING MULCH IN, THEY'RE NOT PRODUCING IT, THEY HAVE NOTHING TO DO OTHER THAN A ONE-TIME REMEDIATION EFFORT, IN A SENSE, TO FILL A HOLE IN THE GROUND.

AND THAT'S WHY THIS ITEM WAS ADDED UNDER INELIGIBLE, BECAUSE WE'VE HAD A NUMBER OF APPLICANTS COME IN AND APPROACH US. PERHAPS THE WORDING IS CONFUSING, AND THAT'S WHAT RAISES THE ISSUE.

MEMBER JONES: BUT WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE TOTAL PACKAGE, WHICH WE LOOKED AT THAT DAY, THE FACT THAT THE DOLLARS WERE GOING TO BUY THE SCREEN OR BUY, YOU KNOW, WHATEVER HE WAS GOING TO USE TO DO THE PROCESSING, ALLOWED HIM TO SPEND HIS OWN DOLLARS TO DO THE LAND APPLICATION THAT'S GOING TO GO ON HIS LAND.

2.2

I MEAN, IT'S A TRADE OF DOLLARS TO GET -- YOU KNOW, REALLY YOU'VE GOT TWO ISSUES HERE. YOU'VE GOT PART OF HIS PROJECT WAS ELIGIBLE AND PART OF IT WASN'T.

MS. TRGOVCICH: THE DISTINCTION THAT I WOULD DRAW
THERE WOULD BE TWOFOLD. THAT, ONE, THE EQUIPMENT THAT'S
BEING USED IS TO PROCESS WASTE COMING FROM A -- IT'S TO
ACTUALLY DO THE PROCESSING INTO MULCH. AND THEN, TWO, THOSE
ARE ONGOING CONTRACTS, IT'S NOT A ONE-TIME REMEDIATION OF A
SPECIFIC PIECE OF LAND, AND THAT'S IT, AND THEN THE FUNDS

ARE NO LONGER BEING USED FOR ANY PURPOSE RELATED TO DIVERSION.

MEMBER JONES: OKAY. I MEAN, I'M GOING TO REMEMBER -- BECAUSE THAT WAS NOT ONE THAT I WANTED TO VOTE FOR, BUT THERE'S FOUR OF US UP HERE. AND IT WAS BECAUSE OF YOUR INELIGIBILITY AND THE FACT THAT ALL THEY WERE DOING WERE TRADING DOLLARS TO GAIN A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE, SEEMS LIKE AN INTERESTING USE OF OUR MONEY. MY OPINION.

MR. EDGAR: THANK YOU FOR THE CLARIFICATION, THAT HELPED ME OUT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT. I DON'T HEAR ANY MOTION, SO --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, WE CAN DO ONE HERE, I'M SURE WE CAN FIGURE THIS OUT. I'LL MOVE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 1999-246, WITH -- I GUESS THE MOTION SHOULD SAY THE ADOPTION OF OPTION TWO.

WAS THERE ANOTHER THING WE HAD TO PICK? MEMBER JONES: YOU WANTED TO ADD TO OPTION TWO, 18 19 REMEMBER?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OPTION TWO --

MS. TRGOVCICH: OKAY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER PENNINGTON: WITH THE ADDITION OF AND WHEN POSSIBLE RECYCLED MATERIAL TO BE USED SHOULD BE MANUFACTURED IN CALIFORNIA OR FROM CALIFORNIA WASTE.

WAS THERE ANOTHER --MEMBER JONES: THE TRANSFORMATION PROJECT. MEMBER PENNINGTON: OH, THAT'S RIGHT, THE TRANSFORMATION PROJECT. MEMBER JONES: FIFTEEN WAS ALTERNATIVE FUELS. MEMBER PENNINGTON: RIGHT, WITH THE ADDITION OF ALTERNATE FUEL -- WHAT DID YOU HAVE? CHAIRMAN EATON: ALTERNATE FUELS FROM THE MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE STREAM. 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: RIGHT. 11 MEMBER JONES: INCLUDING AG CROP RESIDUE. 12 MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY? DOES THAT COVER IT? 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: I THINK SENATOR ROBERTI HAS A 14 COMMENT AS WELL. OR A --15 MEMBER ROBERTI: THE PURPOSE OF (INAUDIBLE). CAN YOU HEAR ME? 16 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT'S FINE WITH ME. 18 MEMBER ROBERTI: OKAY. COULD YOU INCORPORATE THAT 19 IN YOUR MOTION? 20 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES. 21 MEMBER ROBERTI: THEN I'M FINE. 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: YOU MEAN THAT THE -- THERE WOULD 23 BE NO ELIGIBILITY, RIGHT? 24 MEMBER ROBERTI: THERE'S NO ELIGIBILITY.

```
CHAIRMAN EATON: JUST DELETE IT.
             MEMBER ROBERTI: YES, YES. FOR PURPOSES OF THE
   LOAN, NOT FOR PURPOSES OF DIVERSION RATES --
              (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)
             CHAIRMAN EATON: -- WE'RE JUST TALKING IN TERMS OF
             MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?
             CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.
             MEMBER JONES: I'LL SECOND THE MOTION.
10
             CHAIRMAN EATON: SEE, YOU JUST FOUND A FRIEND
11
   THERE.
12
             MEMBER ROBERTI: THAT'S RIGHT, A MEETING OF THE
13
   MINDS.
            MEMBER ROBERTI: CAN WE INCLUDE BALED TIRES IN
14
15
   THAT --
16
             MEMBER JONES: NO.
17
             CHAIRMAN EATON: BUT LO AND BEHOLD, IN THE DEEP,
   DARK RECESSES THERE'S A BALING MACHINE --
18
19
              (THE PARTIES SIMULTANEOUSLY SPEAK.)
20
             CHAIRMAN EATON: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. MR. JONES, YOU
21
   SECONDED THAT --
22
             MEMBER JONES: I DID SECOND MR. PENNINGTON'S
23
   MOTION, WITH ALL THOSE AMENDMENTS.
24
             CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND MR.
```

JONES SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT THE PROPOSED RMDZ LOAN PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA WITH THE CHANGES AS IT RELATES TO TRANSFORMATION PROJECTS, OPTION TWO, WHICH IS THE 15%, WHICH ALSO INCLUDED A PREFERENCE FOR BUYING CALIFORNIA RECYCLED PRODUCTS, IF I'M NOT MISTAKEN, AND THEN DELETING AS PART OF ANY ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENT ADC OR ADC-RELATED TYPE PROJECTS. I THINK THAT --MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT SOUNDS GOOD. CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT. 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YOU GOT MY MOTION CLEAR. 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M TRYING. 12 MEMBER PENNINGTON: EVEN THOUGH I DIDN'T. 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'M CHANNELING, YOU KNOW. MADAM 14 SECRETARY -- IT'S BEEN A WHILE SINCE WE HAD A ROLL CALL, 15 LET'S SEE IF WE'RE ALL STILL HERE -- WOULD YOU...? THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES? 16 17 MEMBER JONES: AYE. THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON? 18 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. 19 20 THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI? 21 MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE. 2.2 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON? 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE. 24 THANK YOU, MR. BLUE.

MR. BLUE: THANK YOU.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MEMBER JONES: YEAH, THANK YOU, NICE JOB.

AGENDA ITEM 18: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF RECYCLING

MARKET DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR

GROVER LANDSCAPE SERVICES, INC.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. 18.

MS. TRGOVCICH: ITEM NO. 18, MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS, IS CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR GROVER LANDSCAPE SERVICES, INC.

JUST TO BRIEFLY REMIND THE MEMBERS ONCE
AGAIN, BEFORE WE GO INTO THE PRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM, THAT
FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR THE BOARD HAS APPROVED AND FUNDED 10
LOANS TOTALING \$7.4 MILLION. WE HAVE AN ADDITIONAL TWO
LOANS TOTALING \$2 MILLION THAT THE BOARD HAS APPROVED WHICH
HAS NOT YET BEEN FUNDED, BRINGING THE TOTAL FOR THIS FISCAL
YEAR TO \$9.4 MILLION.

I'D JUST LIKE TO REQUEST A MOMENT OF SILENCE
AND CONGRATULATION TO THE LOAN STAFF, IT'S AN OUTSTANDING
EFFORT TO ALMOST DOUBLE THE APPROPRIATION AMOUNT FOR THIS
FISCAL YEAR IN TERMS OF LOANS PROCESSED AND FUNDED.

CHAIRMAN EATON: NOW IS THAT PART OF THE PLATINUM CIRCLE OR THE GOLDEN HORSESHOE, OR --

MS. TRGOVCICH: I'LL FIGURE IT OUT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ALL RIGHT.

MS. TRGOVCICH: WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN THE PRESENTATION OVER TO JEFF INGLES.

MR. INGLES: GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIRMAN EATON, BOARD MEMBERS. I'M PLEASED TO PRESENT THIS AFTERNOON RMDZ REQUEST FOR GROVER LANDSCAPE SERVICES, INC., LOCATED IN STANISLAUS COUNTY, A RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE.

GROVER LANDSCAPING HAS APPLIED FOR A \$1

MILLION LOAN TO PURCHASE NEW MACHINERY, EQUIPMENT, LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENTS, AND OTHER ITEMS TO INCREASE PRODUCTION OF THEIR FACILITY. THE PROJECT WILL INCREASE THE PRODUCTION OF COMPOST MATERIAL AND PROVIDE INTERMEDIATE PROCESSING OF GREEN WASTE AND WOOD WASTE MATERIAL.

THE CURRENT DIVERSION OF GROVER LANDSCAPE
SERVICES, INC., IS 50,000 TONS PER YEAR, AND THIS NEW
PROJECT WILL ADD AN ADDITIONAL 100,000 TONS PER YEAR FOR A
TOTAL OF 150,000 TONS PER YEAR.

THE COMPOSTING OPERATION IS LOCATED IN TWO PERMITTED SITES IN STANISLAUS COUNTY.

ON JUNE 17TH, 1999, THE LOAN COMMITTEE MET AND APPROVED THE LOAN REQUEST SUBJECT TO YOUR APPROVAL TODAY, IF IT SO BE, FOR TODAY'S MEETING, THE BOARD MEETING.

IN CONCLUSION, WE'D LIKE TO RECOMMEND

ADOPTION OF 1999-273, THE APPROVAL OF GROVER LANDSCAPE

SERVICES, INC., FOR THE AMOUNT OF THE \$1 MILLION LOAN REQUEST.

AND IF THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS TIME I'D BE HAPPY TO ENTERTAIN THOSE.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS OF --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: ONE OF THE FIRST PLACES I

VISITED WHEN I CAME ON THE BOARD FOUR YEARS AGO WAS GROVER,

THEIR FARM AND SOME OF THE STUFF THEY WERE DOING WITH THEIR

COMPOSTING, AND I ALSO VISITED THEM ONE OTHER TIME.

SO, THEREFORE, I'D BE PLEASED TO MOVE THE ADOPTION OF THE STAFF REPORT AND GRANT THE LOAN.

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. JONES.

16 MEMBER JONES: I'D LIKE TO SECOND THAT MOTION.

17 GROVER HAS A GREAT REPUTATION, AND THAT'S -- WE LIKE DOING 18 BUSINESS LIKE THAT.

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON --

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MY MOTION SHOULD ALSO INCLUDE RESOLUTION -- ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 1999-273.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU. MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND MR. JONES SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT RESOLUTION 1999-273.

WITHOUT OBJECTION WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE

PREVIOUS ROLL CALL. HEARING NO OBJECTION, SO SHALL BE ORDERED.

AND I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO THANK THE STAFF AS WELL. I THINK IT'S REALLY HARD, ESPECIALLY IN TODAY'S ECONOMIC TIMES, WHERE WE ACTUALLY WERE ABLE TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN A MARKET WHERE THE COMPETITION IS VERY, VERY STIFF. AND HOPEFULLY NOW THAT WE'LL BE EVEN MORE COMPETITIVE.

I BELIEVE -- DIDN'T THEY JUST RAISE THE RATES AGAIN FOR PRIME LENDING IN THE LAST COUPLE OF DAYS? SO, YOU KNOW, MAYBE WE CAN REACH THAT \$10 MILLION MARK.

WE'RE JUST GOING TO TAKE A VERY SHORT FIVE-

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST ONE QUICK THING?
CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE.

MEMBER JONES: BASED ON SENATOR ROBERTI'S

DISCUSSIONS AND MINE, AND EVERYBODY ELSE'S, AND THE COMMENTS

OF EVAN, I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS THE APPROPRIATE PLACE, BUT

I THINK THAT WE NEED TO DIRECT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO

TALK TO P&E STAFF, AND LET'S DO A REAL SURVEY AND ASSESSMENT

OF THE USE OF ADC, AND WHERE THE ABUSES ARE.

I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT WE NEED ADC -- BECAUSE
I'VE HAD TO BUY MOUNTAINS, AND I'VE SAID THAT BEFORE -- BUT,
I DON'T AGREE WITH THE ABUSES. I MEAN, I DON'T AGREE WHEN
SOMEBODY PERMITS SOMETHING FOR A THOUSAND TONS INSTEAD OF

700, IF IT'S GOING TO BE 700 OR MORE IT'S GOING TO BE ADC.

SO I'D LIKE TO DO THAT, AND I DIDN'T KNOW -BEFORE WE GOT OFF ORGANICS I THOUGHT IT WAS A GOOD TIME TO
BRING THAT UP, MR. CHAIRMAN.

CHAIRMAN EATON: WELL, I WOULD AGREE
WHOLEHEARTEDLY WITH YOU, AND ASK THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS TO
JOIN WITH YOU.

BECAUSE EVERYPLACE I GO, AND EVEN -- MOST
PEOPLE KNOW THAT I WAS ONE OF THE STAFF PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY
DID THE BUSTAMANTE BILL THAT SORT OF ALLOWED THE,
QUOTE/UNQUOTE, "FICTION" TO BE THE CASE -- BUT, WHEREVER WE
GO WE SEE PEOPLE POINTING THEIR FINGERS AT ADC AS THE EVIL
TO WHY THEY CAN'T CREATE A MARKET. IT DOESN'T MATTER WHICH
SEGMENT IT MIGHT BE, IT COULD BE IN THE COMPOST AREA, IT
COULD BE IN THE TIRE AREA, IT COULD BE COGEN PLANTS.

2.2

I THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA. WHY DON'T WE JUST TRY TO GET TOGETHER WITH MR. CHANDLER, AND IF WE COULD DIRECT HIM TO COME BACK WITH SOME PROPOSALS ABOUT HOW TO GO ABOUT IT SO THE BOARD CAN HAVE SOME INPUT AS AN ITEM I THINK THAT WOULD BE GOOD, AND WORK WITH THE STAFF WHO HAVE HAD SOME EXPERIENCE ON IT AND SEE IF WE CAN'T AT LEAST SEPARATE FACT FROM FICTION AS IT RELATES TO THE ADC ISSUE, AND SOME OF THE PROPOSED ABUSES.

MEMBER JONES: THANKS, MR. CHAIRMAN.

MR. CHANDLER: AND I'D BE PLEASED TO DO THAT. I'M RIGHT WITH YOU. MEMBER JONES HAD ALREADY MADE A NOTE BEFORE WE WILL BE GETTING INTO THIS A BIT.

I THINK WHAT I WILL DO IS EITHER INDIVIDUALLY WORK AROUND --

CHAIRMAN EATON: THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

MR. CHANDLER: -- PUT AN OUTLINE TOGETHER IN THE NEXT COUPLE OF WEEKS, AND WE'LL FRAME IT OUT SO THAT WE DON'T RUN OFF AND PRODUCE CHARTS AND GRAPHS AND INFORMATION WITHOUT GETTING IT PROPERLY OUTLINED AS TO EXACTLY WHAT YOU'D LIKE TO SEE IN THIS STUDY. SO I'LL DO THAT IN THE NEXT COUPLE OF WEEKS.

CHAIRMAN EATON: A SHORT FIVE-MINUTE RECESS.

(OFF THE RECORD; BRIEF RECESS.)

CHAIRMAN EATON: BACK IN SESSION.

ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

AGENDA ITEM 19: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF

REALLOCATION OF PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONTRACT CONCEPT MONIES

TO AUGMENT CONTRACT #IWM-C7039 WITH THE CALIFORNIA

CONSERVATION CORPS

CHAIRMAN EATON: ITEM NO. 19, MOVING INTO ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY.

MS. FRIEDMAN: GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIRMAN EATON AND BOARD MEMBERS. FOR THE RECORD, I'M JUDY FRIEDMAN, DEPUTY

DIRECTOR WITH THE DIVERSION PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION.

THE NEXT TWO ITEMS ARE RELATED. ITEM 19 IS

CONSIDERATION OF REALLOCATION OF CONTRACT CONCEPT MONIES FOR

AN AUGMENTATION OF A CONTRACT WITH THE CALIFORNIA

CONSERVATION CORPS. ITEM 20 IS THE ACTUAL AWARD OF THE

CONTRACT TO AUGMENT THE EXISTING CCC CONTRACT BY \$500,000.

THE BULK OF THE DISCUSSION WILL BE IN ITEM

19, WHERE THE APPROACH WILL BE DESCRIBED BY STAFF.

AND WITH THAT, I'D LIKE TO TURN THE

PRESENTATION OVER TO BOB BOUGHTON, WITH THE USED OIL AND
HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE BRANCH, WHO WILL BE MAKING THE
PRESENTATION FOR STAFF.

MR. BOUGHTON: THANKS, JUDY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS, AS JUDY

MENTIONED, THIS IS -- ITEM 19 IS ASKING FOR THE REALLOCATION

OF UNSPENT CONTRACT DOLLARS FROM CURRENT YEAR CONCEPTS TO

AUGMENT THE CCC CONTRACT.

AND, AS YOU KNOW, CCC HAS BEEN CONDUCTING

USED OIL OUTREACH AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FOR

SEVERAL YEARS NOW WITH A PROGRAM PRINCIPALLY TARGETING RURAL

AND UNDER-SERVED AREAS IN THE STATE, MOSTLY IN THEIR SERVICE

AREA.

THEY'RE CURRENTLY UNDER A TWO-YEAR CONTRACT,

AND TO DATE THEY PROVIDED CONSIDERABLE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND CLASSROOM PRESENTATIONS TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. AND THE DETAILS OF THAT ARE MORE PRESENTED IN ITEM 20.

BECAUSE OF ALL OF THE EFFORTS THAT THEY'VE
EXPENDED THUS FAR THEY'RE RUNNING OUT OF THEIR CURRENT FUNDS
IN THE CURRENT CONTRACT, AND IN JULY OR SO THEY'LL RUN OUT
OF THEIR MONIES, AND THAT'S WHY WE'RE HERE TODAY. THERE ARE
FUNDS AVAILABLE FROM THE UNSPENT CONTRACT FUNDS FROM THE
CURRENT YEAR TO REALLOCATE.

AS I MENTIONED, THE CCC HAS FOCUSED THEIR EFFORT ON RURAL AND UNDER-SERVED AREAS. AND NOW I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE SOME MORE DETAIL ON HOW WE WOULD LIKE THE CCC TO FOCUS ON -- WITH THE ADDITIONAL MONIES IF IT IS AWARDED.

2.2

BECAUSE THERE ARE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF

COMMUNITIES WHICH ARE IN NEED OF ASSISTANCE, AND MANY OF

WHICH -- OF THOSE HAVE NOT MET THE 25% GOAL IN 1995, AND MAY

NOT MEET THE 50% GOAL AS WELL -- AT THE SUGGESTION OF MR.

EATON, I'VE WORKED WITH JUDY FRIEDMAN AND PAT SCHIAVO TO

COME UP WITH A LIST OF THOSE JURISDICTIONS.

WE HAVE ABOUT 40 JURISDICTIONS WHICH ARE NOT MEETING THE 25% GOAL, WHICH HAVE HAD THE BIENNIAL REVIEWS COMPLETED. AND THEN THERE'S A LIST OF ABOUT 60 COMMUNITIES WHICH HAVE RECEIVED NOTICE OF A COMPLIANCE HEARING IN SEPTEMBER.

SO OUT OF THOSE 100 JURISDICTIONS -- AND I
BELIEVE I PROVIDED THIS LIST TO ALL OF YOUR OFFICES
YESTERDAY -- OUT OF THIS 100, THEN, WE HAD OUR GRANT
MANAGERS REVIEW THIS LIST AND KIND OF AS A TRIAGE LIST THE
ONES THAT HAVE SIGNIFICANT AND ADEQUATE PROGRAMS, AND THE
ONES THAT ARE REALLY LACKING IN TERMS OF PROGRAMS, WE HAVE
KIND OF A ONE, TWO, THREE SCALE.

AND OUT OF THAT LIST, IT'S INTERESTING TO

NOTE, THE RESULTS ARE THAT THERE'S ABOUT 15 THAT ARE -- HAVE

VERY LIMITED OIL PROGRAMS THAT ARE ON THIS LIST, AND THOSE

COULD BE A TOP PRIORITY FOR CCC TO VISIT.

2.2

THERE WAS ANOTHER 30-PLUS THAT HAVE OIL PROGRAMS BUT WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY BENEFIT FROM CCC ASSISTING THEM, AND THAT'S ON THIS LIST AS KIND OF A NUMBER TWO. AND ALONG WITH THAT LIST I'D LIKE TO, YOU KNOW, INCLUDE THE OTHER LOCAL -- RURAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS THAT ARE IN NEED OF OIL ASSISTANCE KIND OF AS A SECOND TIER.

AND THEN AS A THIRD TIER, THERE'S PROBABLY 15
OR SO WHICH ARE VERY -- ON THIS LIST OF A HUNDRED THAT ARE
VERY EASY FOR CCC TO PICK UP, BECAUSE WHEN THEY'RE WORKING
IN ONE PARTICULAR REGION OR A COUNTY IT'S EASY FOR THEM TO
HIT THESE OTHER CITIES. SO, ALL TOTALED, ON THIS LIST
THERE'S 60-PLUS THAT ARE EASY HITS FOR CCC TO PERFORM IN
CONJUNCTION WITH WHAT THEY'RE DOING ALREADY IN THE RURAL AND

UNDER-SERVED AREAS.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

SO, THAT I WANTED TO BRING FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION TO SEE IF THAT'S A GOOD WAY TO HELP FOCUS CCC'S EFFORT.

AND, WITH THAT, I WOULD LIKE TO OPEN IT UP TO QUESTIONS AFTER I PRESENT THE OPTION. WHICH IS, TO APPROVE THE REALLOCATION OF CONTRACT CONCEPT FUNDS AND ADOPT RESOLUTION 1999-282.

CHAIRMAN EATON: ANY QUESTIONS FOR MR. BOUGHTON?

MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: YES.

MEMBER JONES: I'M GOING TO MOVE THIS MOTION -OR, MOVE THIS RESOLUTION.

BUT, I DO WANT TO SAY FOR THE -- AND I'M NOT SURE IF THE CHAIRMAN WAS HERE WHEN -- THE CCC CAME FORWARD LAST YEAR OR THE YEAR BEFORE FOR A FUNDING REQUEST FOR A MILLION AND A HALF. RIGHT? TWO YEARS AGO. I THINK, YEAH, FOR A MILLION AND A HALF. AND WHAT WE DID AT THAT TIME WAS, WE SAID, YOU KNOW, TRY TO WORK WITH THE LOCALS AND SEE WHAT KIND OF MONEY YOU CAN GET OUT OF THE OPPORTUNITY GRANTS THAT WE GAVE OTHER CITIES AND SEE IF YOU CAN HELP FUND YOURSELF THROUGH THAT. AND I KNOW THEY DID THAT. THAT WAS ONE OF THE QUESTIONS I ASKED. AND I THINK YOU -- I THINK THE CCC'S GOT HOOKED UP WITH 20 OR 30 CITIES, OR 10 --

MR. BOUGHTON: I THINK 40 OR SO.

MEMBER JONES: FORTY?

MR. BOUGHTON: YEAH, 40 OR SO --

MEMBER JONES: FORTY CITIES TO USE

THOSE OPPORTUNITY DOLLARS. AND IT WAS THE REQUEST OF THIS BOARD -- AND I -- TRUTHFULLY, I THINK I MADE THE MOTION AT THE TIME TO GO OUT AND SEE

WHAT YOU COULD DO TO GET LOCAL MONEY SO WE

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DIDN'T SPEND A MILLION AND A HALF, WE'LL GIVE YOU A HALF-A-MILLION NOW AND SEE WHAT YOU CAN DO, AND THEY DID THAT.

AND THEY NEED THE FUNDING, AND I THINK THEY
PROVIDE A VALUE, AND I'M GOING TO MOVE -- IF THERE AREN'T
MORE QUESTIONS -- I'M GOING TO MOVE THE ADOPTION OF
RESOLUTION 1999-282, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCHEDULE
THAT YOU PUT OUT, BOB, TO BE ADHERED TO.

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION.

I'D LIKE TO THANK BOB AND THE STAFF, BECAUSE
I THINK THIS IS A PERFECT ISSUE AS WE COME UP -- YOU KNOW,
WE'VE HAD A LOT WITH BASE-YEAR AND WHAT HAVE YOU, AND WE'VE
SAT DOWN AND WENT THROUGH SOME OF THIS STUFF. AND IT WAS
DIFFICULT, BECAUSE COMMUNICATING AND TRYING TO FIGURE OUT
WAYS TO DO IT, THERE'S A LOT MORE COMPLICATIONS THAT LIE
BELOW THAT WE AS BOARD MEMBERS SOMETIMES DON'T UNDERSTAND.
BUT WE TRIED TO MEET HALFWAY.

AND IT'S ONE OF THESE SITUATIONS THAT WHILE WE HAVE SOME OF THESE MONIES, OR THESE MONIES ARE AVAILABLE THAT MAY BE LEFT OVER, THEY SHOULD GO TO WHERE PEOPLE WHO NEED THAT HELP, SO THAT WHEN THEY COME BACK AND SAY WE DIDN'T HAVE THE MONEY FOR THE PROGRAMS, WE CAN'T DO THE PROGRAMS, NOW WE ARE GIVING THEM NO WAY TO SAY NO TO THE HELP BECAUSE WE'RE GIVING IT TO THEM FREE. AND I THINK THAT THIS IS JUST ONE OF THE EXAMPLES, AND CCC IS A GOOD ORGANIZATION. AND I JUST THINK THAT IT'S GOOD THAT WE 10 TARGET SOME OF OUR FUNDS FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE IN NEED. 11 SO, MR. JONES MOVES AND MR. EATON SECONDS 12 THAT WE ADOPT RESOLUTION 1999-282. 13 WITHOUT OBJECTION, IF WE CAN SUBSTITUTE THE 14 PREVIOUS ROLL CALL? HEARING NO OBJECTION, SO SHALL BE 15 ORDERED. 16 MR. BOUGHTON: THANK YOU. // 17 18 // 19 AGENDA ITEM 20: 20 CONSIDERATION OF AWARD OF CONTRACT AUGMENTATION OF 21 \$500,000 TO CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS FOR CONTRACT #IWM-22 C7039 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: THE FINAL ITEM FOR THE DAY WILL 24 BE ITEM NO. 20, WHICH IS THE ACTUAL AWARD OF THE CONTRACT.

MEMBER JONES: THE MONEY.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIRMAN EATON: THE MONEY. ARE YOU THE CLOSER,
LIKE IN A CAR DEAL? I DON'T WANT THE EXTRA WAX OR ALARM
SYSTEM.

MS. FRIEDMAN: MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS, JIM ROBINSON WILL BE MAKING THE PRESENTATION FOR STAFF.

MR. ROBINSON: GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIRMAN EATON,
BOARD MEMBERS. MY NAME IS JIM ROBINSON, I'M WITH THE USED
OIL GRANT PROGRAM.

WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS JUST GIVE A VERY SHORT HISTORY OF ITEM NO. 20, AND THEN INTRODUCE KRISTIANA VIDUYA, WHO IS THE PROJECT SUPPORT MANAGER OF CCC. SHE'LL BE GIVING A PRESENTATION AND THEN ANSWER ANY TYPE OF QUESTIONS THAT YOU MAY HAVE.

THE BOARD AWARDED THE CCC CONCEPT IN

DECEMBER, 1997, TO STRENGTHEN RELATIONS WITH GRANTEES BY

PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR THE LOCAL PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING

EDUCATION OUTREACH TO TARGET ANOTHER 75,000 STUDENTS.

THE CONTRACT TERM IS FROM DECEMBER 15TH, '97,
THROUGH MAY OF 2000, AND IT'S FUNDED AT \$1 MILLION. THE CCC
INDICATES THAT THIS FUNDING WOULD BE EXHAUSTED BY JUNE,
1999, AND IS REQUESTING ANOTHER \$500,000 AUGMENTATION FOR
THE REMAINING PERIOD.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL.

I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE KRISTIANA VIDUYA NOW TO GIVE HER PRESENTATION.

CHAIRMAN EATON: WELCOME.

MS. VIDUYA: CHAIRMAN EATON AND BOARD MEMBERS, I HAVE A SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION IF YOU'D LIKE TO SEE IT REGARDING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS THAT WE'VE HAD. IS THAT INTERESTING TO YOU NOW?

CHAIRMAN EATON: SURE.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

MS. VIDUYA: AS YOU PROBABLY KNOW FROM YOUR BRIEFINGS, THE CCC'S MISSION IS TO PROVIDE MEANINGFUL WORK AND OPPORTUNITIES TO ASSIST YOUNG PEOPLE IN PROJECTS LIKE YOURS, DOING RESOURCE -- EXCUSE ME -- ENHANCING THE RESOURCES AND PROVIDING BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY. THE PICTURES THAT I'LL BE SHOWING TODAY ARE FROM THE FUNDING THAT YOU'VE PROVIDED.

ANNUALLY WE PROVIDE OVER \$3 MILLION WORTH OF NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION WORK, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, TREE PLANTING, AND PARK DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS EMERGENCY RESPONSE. YOU'VE PROBABLY SEEN US IN THE MEDIA.

THE ORIGINAL REQUEST -- AND YOU SPOKE TO IT

JUST BRIEFLY -- IS WE CAME ASKING FOR 1.6 MILLION, YOU ASKED

US TO GO FIND SOME PARTNERS, AND COME BACK LATER. AND WE'VE

SPENT ABOUT 700,000 TO DATE. OUR REQUEST IS THE \$500,000.

FRIDAY AT FIVE O'CLOCK WE GOT THE LIST FAXED

OVER TO SAY CAN YOU WORK IN THESE AREAS, IS THIS SOMETHING
THAT YOU CAN DO. SO, FEVERISHLY, OVER THE WEEKEND WE
LOOKED, AND CAN WE SERVE? YES, WE CAN WORK IN THOSE AREAS.

THERE'S MANY OF THE CITIES THAT ARE LISTED

HERE THAT WE ALREADY PROVIDE SERVICES TO. WE WORK IN

COOPERATION WITH THE LOCAL CORPS. AND, ALTHOUGH SOME OF THE

SITES ARE SLIGHTLY REMOTE, OVER THREE HOURS FOR US TO

COMMUTE THERE, WE HAVE ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO SERVICE THEM.

AND I'D LIKE TO TELL YOU A LITTLE BIT ABOUT
THE PROGRAM. WE PROVIDE THE RECYCLING EDUCATION PROGRAM IN
SCHOOLS, TO HIGH SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, AND AT
DIFFERENT EVENTS. THE CLASSROOM EDUCATION INVOLVES
INTERACTIVE LEARNING, PEER INSTRUCTION, WHICH IS ONE OF THE
BEST THINGS OF -- THE TEACHERS LIKE ABOUT IT, AS WELL AS
BILINGUAL PRESENTATIONS. WE'RE FOCUSING ON AUTO SHOP AND
DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

2.2

IN THE PRE- AND POST-SURVEY

RESULTS -- PRE- AND POST-SURVEY RESULTS SHOW THAT THERE'S AN

INCREASE IN AWARENESS FROM THE TIME THAT WE COME IN, ASK

THE FEEDBACK INCLUDES THAT THEY REALLY LIKE

OUR PRESENTERS AND THAT THEY STRESS THAT THE STUDENTS HAVE

THE POWER TO VOICE THEIR CONCERN ABOUT CARING FOR THE

ENVIRONMENT, AND THAT WE DELIVER CLEAR INFORMATION AND A

THEM WHAT DO THEY KNOW ABOUT USED OIL RECYCLING TO NOW.

NICE VARIETY OF TEACHING METHODS.

2.2

THE PRESENTATIONS WE'VE BEEN

FOCUSING ON ARE THE RURAL AND UNDER-SERVED AREAS. THAT'S

THE 56 AND THE 30% IN THE TOP TWO, AND 13% IN THE OTHER.

THE OTHER CATEGORY IS NOT RURAL OR UNDER-SERVED.

COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC OUTREACH. WE TARGET THE DO-IT-YOURSELFER. THAT'S ONE OF THE THINGS THAT THE BOARD ASKED US TO DO. WE ASSIST AT HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE EVENTS, STAFFING BOOTHS AT AIR SHOWS AND CAR SHOWS, ANYPLACE WHERE THE DO-IT-YOURSELFER MIGHT BE. DISTRIBUTING DOOR-TO-DOOR LITERATURE, ENCOURAGING CURBSIDE RECYCLING AND, OF COURSE, OFFERING BILINGUAL PRESENTATIONS.

FOR THE GRANTEES WE DO STORM DRAIN
STENCILING, DO THE PRESENTATIONS, LEAFLET DISTRIBUTION,
SURVEYS. THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF US DOING SURVEYS.

THE COUNTIES AND THE CITIES THAT YOU ASKED US TO FOCUS ON ARE LISTED HERE. WE HAVE GONE AND MET WITH ALL OF THEM THAT YOU'VE ASKED US TO CONCENTRATE ON.

ON CUSTOMER SATISFACTION, IN YOUR AGENDA ITEM IT DISCUSSED THE '97 SURVEY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. IN ADDITION TO THAT, OUR PLANNING AND QUALITY ASSURANCE GROUP DOES CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEYS. ON A SCALE OF ONE TO 10 ALL OF THEM ARE RIGHT NEAR NINE AND A HALF, FINDING US TIMELY, COMPLETE, COURTEOUS, OVERALL POSITIVE, THAT WE FULFILL THE

COMMITMENT AND PROVIDE A GOOD COMMUNITY BENEFIT, AND THEY WOULD DEFINITELY WORK WITH US AGAIN.

AND WHAT THEY LIKE BEST ABOUT THIS PROGRAM IS
THAT THEY CONSIDER IT NO-COST. YOU KNOW, IT'S, OF COURSE, A
COST TO THE TAXPAYERS, BUT THEY CAN -- THE GRANTEES CONSIDER
IT NO-COST TO THEM, AND THAT'S WHY WE REALLY APPRECIATE
GOING INTO THE NEW AREAS.

AN EXAMPLE OF SOME OF OUR DISPLAYS.

SOME OF THE BENEFITS ARE, OF COURSE,

TARGETING THE AREAS THAT YOU SEE FIT. THE STATEWIDE

FLEXIBILITY IN THE PROGRAM, BECAUSE WE CAN SEND CORPS

MEMBERS JUST ABOUT EVERYWHERE. WE HAVE RESIDENTIAL SITES

LOCATED THROUGHOUT THE STATE. AND THE PROGRAM INCLUDES THE

STAFF SUPERVISION, TRANSPORTATION, SAFETY EQUIPMENT, THE

EVALUATIONS, ALL THE MULTI-MEDIA MATERIALS, AND THE

COORDINATION, LOGISTICS, AND THE STATEWIDE REPORTING.

2.2

THE STUDENTS LEARN THE VALUE OF RECYCLING,

THE IMPORTANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, AND THEY REALLY

BENEFIT FROM THE PEER INSTRUCTION.

THESE ARE THE BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY.

THEY'RE PART OF THE EFFORT. THEY SEE THE OUTWARD SIGNS BY HAVING THEIR STORM DRAINS STENCILED. AND MANY TIMES THE CORPS MEMBERS ARE LOCAL KIDS THAT ARE DELIVERING THE PRESENTATIONS TO THE SCHOOLS.

ONE OF THE GREATEST THINGS, FOR ME, IS WHAT
IT DOES FOR OUR CORPS MEMBERS. IT ENHANCES THEIR
OPPORTUNITIES. THIS KIND OF PROGRAM IS DIFFERENT THAN OUR
TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE CONSERVATION WORK. WHAT THEY'RE
ABLE TO DO IS DEVELOP PUBLIC SPEAKING SKILLS, THEY LEARN
TEAMWORK, THE INCREASED SELF-CONFIDENCE IS FABULOUS. SELFESTEEM AND LEADERSHIP SKILLS. WE SEE A LOT OF PEOPLE MOVING
INTO LEADERSHIP POSITIONS AFTER THEY'VE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY
TO LEAD THROUGH CLASSROOM PRESENTATIONS.

HERE ARE SOME OF THE THINGS THAT WE'VE DONE
IN THE LAST COUPLE YEARS FOR YOU. PROVIDED PRESENTATIONS AT
A NUMBER OF SCHOOLS. TALKED TO NEARLY 70,000 PEOPLE. WE
WORKED ALMOST 12,000 HOURS FOR LOCAL GRANTEES. REACHED OVER
20,000 STUDENTS. AND, YOU'VE TRAINED OVER 200 CORPS
MEMBERS, YOUNG PEOPLE 18 TO 24, IN THE USED OIL RECYCLING
MESSAGE, AND THEY'RE SENDING THAT MESSAGE OUT. AND OVER
7,000 STORM DRAINS STENCILED.

2.2

WHAT WE'VE DONE SPECIFICALLY TO HELP DEVELOP

OUR GRANTEE PARTNERSHIPS IS -- IN COOPERATION WITH YOUR

STAFF -- WE DID A MASS MAILING WITH FOLLOW-UP CALLS, WE'VE

WRITTEN ARTICLES FOR RCRC, THE RURAL COUNCIL OF RURAL

CITIES, REGIONAL COUNCIL OF RURAL CITIES, AND THE LOCAL

GOVERNMENT COMMISSION. WE PARTICIPATE IN CEIN, WHICH IS THE

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL INTERAGENCY NETWORK. AND, WE'RE

WORKING TO DEVELOP LANGUAGE FOR POSSIBLE NOFAS (PHONETIC)
FOR THE NEXT FUNDING CYCLE.

SO, THE PLANS FOR THE CCC AND OUR PARTNERSHIP FOR THE REST OF THIS YEAR AND BEYOND, WHAT WE HOPE TO DO IS TO CONCENTRATE ON THE AREAS THAT YOU'D LIKE US TO, TO EXPAND OUR PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, TO BROADEN THE FUNDING THROUGH MORE COLLABORATIONS, INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS, AND TO WORK WITH THE BOARD TO DEVELOP NEW PROGRAMS INTO THE FUTURE.

SO, AGAIN, OUR REQUEST IS \$500,000 FROM THE BOARD.

CHAIRMAN EATON: THANK YOU.

ANY QUESTIONS? OKAY.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN?

CHAIRMAN EATON: MR. PENNINGTON.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'D BE HAPPY TO MOVE ADOPTION
OF RESOLUTION 1999-280.

CHAIRMAN EATON: AND I'LL SECOND THAT MOTION.

MEMBER ROBERTI: SECOND.

CHAIRMAN EATON: OH, THERE'S A THIRD AND A SECOND,

21 WE'LL TAKE THE THIRD AND WE'LL LEAVE THE SECOND.... I'M

22 READY TO BAIL.

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

MR. PENNINGTON MOVES AND SENATOR ROBERTI

24 SECONDS THAT WE ADOPT THE RESOLUTION AND AWARD OF THIS

CONTRACT AND THE MONEY.

SINCE THIS IS AN AWARD OF MONEY, MADAM

SECRETARY, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL?

THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBERS JONES?

MEMBER JONES: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: ROBERTI?

MEMBER ROBERTI: AYE.

THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN EATON?

CHAIRMAN EATON: AYE.

12 THAT COMPLETES TODAY'S PORTION OF OUR TWO-DAY

13 MEETING. TOMORROW WE WILL ONCE AGAIN START AT 9:30 IN THE

14 MORNING. UPON COMPLETION OF THAT SEGMENT WE WILL GO INTO A

CLOSED SESSION ON A COUPLE OF MATTERS THAT INVOLVE PERSONNEL

16 AND/OR LITIGATION.

17 SO, UNTIL 9:30 TOMORROW WE STAND IN RECESS.

18 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

19 (WHEREUPON, THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE ADJOURNED.)

20

10

11

15